

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION AT PROVIDENCE

A CITY of many historic memories and not a few ancient buildings, Providence is an eminently suitable place in which to hold one of the annual meetings of the American Historical Association. It is also so convenient of access by railroad from an area richly populated with members of the Association that about three hundred attended. As four other associations, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the Bibliographical Society of America and the American Sociological Society, held their annual meetings at the same time and place, and the New England History Teachers' Association assembled with the national historical body on one of the days, the resources of Providence with respect to hotel accommodations were taxed to their utmost. More serious was the sense of mental crowding and confusion which is inevitably produced by sessions so numerous, even if the Historical Association had not had, as it certainly did have, too full a programme. One who paused to reflect, if any were able to achieve that feat during those three days, must have felt some longings for those simpler days when as yet the other societies were not, days of quieter sessions, before the age—we need not borrow Burke's unamiable phrase about the age "of sophisters, economists and calculators"—but before the period of "entangling alliances".

But anything like physical crowding was wholly avoided by the careful arrangements made by the local committee, whose work deserves all praise, and by the fortunate presence, on or near the grounds of Brown University, of an abundance of suitable halls and rooms for the meetings and for the entertainment of all the societies. Seldom if ever at any annual meeting have all things

proceeded so smoothly. An especial advantage for such sessions was offered by the rooms of the Brown Union, abounding in opportunities for meeting and conversation, and supplemented by those afforded by the University Club. The larger gatherings were held in Sayles Hall and Manning Hall of Brown University. Receptions or luncheons were offered by the university, by the committee of management of the John Carter Brown Library, by the Rhode Island Historical Society, and by Mr. William B. Weeden, chairman of the committee of local arrangements, and Mrs. Weeden. The Rhode Island School of Design made all the societies free of its buildings and collections; and there was the usual "smoker". •

The first evening, that of Wednesday, December 26, was occupied with a felicitous address of welcome by President Faunce of Brown University, and with the inaugural addresses of Professor J. W. Jenks of Cornell University, president of the American Economic Association, and of Judge Simeon E. Baldwin of New Haven, president of the American Historical Association, heard in joint session of the two bodies. Judge Baldwin's address, entitled "Religion Still the Key to History", has already been printed, in the January number of this journal. The subject of that of Professor Jenks was, "The Modern Standard of Business Honor". He first adverted to the new conditions under which modern business is conducted: the scale on which it is carried on, vastly larger than ever before; the want of personal contact between the business man and his workmen or his customers; the heightened extent to which directors of corporations are trustees for numerous stockholders; and the increased profits from monopolies that are technically legal, but economically and socially unjustifiable. He showed how the rapid development of these conditions had often prevented the evil of unjust courses from being fully and clearly seen. He urged that, while the state should go farther in forbidding unscrupulous practices and in enforcing publicity in the management of great business enterprises, yet it was plain from human nature and the experience of the ages that we must after all look to individual morals and the efforts of individuals as the chief sources of improvement, and must place the responsibility upon ourselves as individuals.

The subsequent sessions of the Association were divided, as usual, between those which were occupied with formal papers or prepared addresses and those which bore the character of free conferences on special topics. The session of Thursday morning was of the former sort, and was given to papers in European history. Professor

George L. Burr of Cornell University discoursed informally on "Protestantism and Tolerance". After glancing at the rise of intolerance in the early church, which served the sixteenth-century reformers as a model, and sketching the causes which at the close of the Middle Ages had brought about a practical freedom of thought not since reached perhaps in continental Europe, he followed in some detail the growing intolerance of the reformers, pointing out how by 1529-1530, the date of the birth of "Protestantism", Luther and his colleagues were advocating the punishment of heresy—and by death—under the name of sedition or of blasphemy, though it was left for Calvin to restore fully to heresy its place as a crime and to make valid in Protestantism the penal laws of the Middle Ages.

Professor Dana C. Munro of the University of Wisconsin dwelt on "The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century". The increasing study of the classical writers in that century he regarded as merely the culmination of a movement which had been going on through the preceding centuries. There was no distinct renaissance of letters. But the twelfth century was characterized in a remarkable degree by the evolution of the spirit of independence, not only in such matters as the growth of freedom and self-consciousness in communes and guilds, but especially in the prevalence of the spirit of free inquiry on the part of scholars, largely influenced by Aristotle, in the growth of interest in science, and in the enhancement of the practical desire to turn all things to immediate use.

Mr. Henry Osborn Taylor of New York City read an interesting paper entitled "An Instance of Medieval Humanism: Some Letters of Hildebert of Lavardin". Hildebert of Lavardin, who became bishop of Le Mans in 1095, and in 1125 archbishop of Tours, finely exemplifies in the balance and temperance of his attitude towards life, and incidentally in his facile scholarship, the subtle working of the antique culture upon character and temperament. As a classical scholar he was unexcelled in his time, and was a skillful writer of both prose and verse. Some of his poems in elegiac metre have been mistaken by comparatively modern scholars for genuine antiques. In his elegy on Rome, one of his best, one is almost startled to hear the frank medieval note of admiration for the idols of pagan Rome. And yet the major part of Hildebert was Christian, as his theological writings thoroughly attest. His classic tastes gave temperance to his Christian views. How sweetly the elements were mixed in him appears in a famous letter written to William of Champeaux, wherein he balances temperately and soundly the advantages of the active and the contemplative life. Hildebert's writings evince that kind

of classical scholarship which springs only from great study and great love. His soul does not appear to have been riven by a consciousness of sin in this behalf. Sometimes he passes so gently from Christian to pagan ethics, as to lead one to suspect that he did not deeply feel the inconsistency between them. Or again he seems satisfied with the moral reasonings of paganism, and sets them forth without a qualm. For instance in a letter which he writes to King Henry consoling him upon the loss of his son in the *White Ship* there is a strain of reasoning which would much more naturally have come from the lips of Seneca than from an archbishop of the time of St. Bernard. But the antique in Hildebert's ethical consolations reflects a manner of reasoning rather than an emotional mood. The emotion, the love and yearning, of medieval religion was largely the gift of Christianity.

Miss Louise R. Loomis of Cornell University followed with a paper on "The Greek Renaissance in Italy". The conventional view has described that movement as the abrupt recovery at the close of the fourteenth century and the opening of the fifteenth of the long-forgotten stores of Hellenic literature, and the emancipation under its stimulating influence of the Italian intellect from the bondage of medieval ignorance and superstition. Against this view she urged the temporary revival of Greek by the schoolmen of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the superficiality of the knowledge of Greek actually acquired by the Italian humanists of the early fifteenth century, the conventional quality of their eulogies of Hellenic literature, the many evidences that the culture which deeply impressed them and elicited their real admiration was that of Rome and Alexandria, that their literary model was Cicero, their Platonism secondary and derivative.

In a discussion of the last three of these papers Professors James H. Robinson of Columbia University and Paul Van Dyke of Princeton endeavored to bring them into unity by dealing with the Renaissance as a movement continuing through several centuries, rather than comprised in any one century. Professor Robinson set forth this thesis in its more extreme form, Professor Van Dyke in one more qualified, representing the fifteenth century more distinctly as the culmination of a long process.

While these papers were being read, the Bibliographical Society of America was considering topics which were in large part historical or of interest to the writers of history. Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin read portions of a valuable report on the bibliographical work of historical socie-

ties, and Dr. J. F. Jameson in response to inquiry gave some information as to such bibliographical work as is undertaken by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution. The need of a bibliography of American colonial newspapers was considered by Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, in a formal paper, and in remarks by Mr. William Nelson of the New Jersey Historical Society, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits of the Lenox Library, and others. A committee was appointed to consider the proper mode of description of such files. Another body of source-material of much interest to students of American history was brought under discussion by Mr. Theodore L. Cole of Washington, who described the plans of the Association of American Law Schools for preparing by united effort a catalogue of printed issues of American colonial laws. A committee to consider co-operation on the part of the Bibliographical Society of America was appointed. At a later session the society took up the subject of an international catalogue of the current literature of the social sciences, including history.

On the afternoon of Thursday the American Historical Association held a joint session with the New England History Teachers' Association, devoted to the consideration of a report prepared by the Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools. The conference was presided over by Professor James A. James of Northwestern University, chairman of that committee. The portion of the report presented on this occasion was that which dealt with history in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades of the elementary schools. Professor James spoke of the methods used in reaching the conclusions, and of the purpose of the committee in its work. The committee desired to re-assert their belief that the subject-matter for a course in the elementary schools and especially for the last three grades should be selected from the field of American history. In the sixth grade it is recommended that attention be devoted to the beginnings of American history in England and in Europe at large, with a view to showing the historical dependence of American history and institutions upon the Old World; in the seventh grade should be studied the discovery, exploration and colonial history of America, while the last year should be given over to the history of the United States. The teacher's main task should be to give an historical representation of our national life, rather than to recount the events which have happened in America since the first discovery. He should aim mainly to teach the child what his fellow human beings have done and are doing and to

show him how to co-operate with them. He should endeavor to make clear the close relation of history with other subjects, especially its vital connection with geography and civics. It will be seen that the main features of the programme presented a year ago are retained.

Dr. Julius Sachs of Columbia University, a member of the committee, led in the discussion following the presentation of the report, remarked that the committee had abandoned as futile all attempt to develop an ideal plan of history teaching. They had, however, adopted a grouping of the work so broad that, as they hoped, it afforded the fullest scope for the most accomplished elementary teacher of history, and again so flexible that the teacher of lesser attainments, of restricted opportunities for self-culture, can make it the basis of a sound and logical presentation. No rigid adherence in detail to the minor sub-divisions of each year's work was contemplated. He pointed out, as an advantage of the plan, that the old method of going over the same ground each year was abandoned and a continuous narrative could be presented.

This last point was enlarged upon by Superintendent H. P. Lewis of Worcester, who maintained that the old method in striving after thoroughness had defeated its own purpose. Pupils, he said, had actually less knowledge of the facts of American history after two or three years of repetition than when their study of it had been confined to a single year, and furthermore by the time when they entered the high school had lost their interest in history. He believed that the report of the committee would commend itself to every earnest teacher of American history in our elementary schools; but suggested that the study of European history recommended for the sixth grade was rather too difficult, and believed in general that more emphasis should be placed on the economic aspects of history. Professor Herbert D. Foster of Dartmouth College commended the plan. He agreed with the suggestion as to the economic phases of history, but as to the place given to European history believed that it should be made even larger. To study the continuous development of some other country, say England, would help to keep the pupil from a provincially American turn of mind. Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor in Vassar College, discussed the principal defects in the teaching of history in elementary schools. She traced them to inefficiency in the mass of such teachers as can now be tempted into the work of school-teaching, to the exaltation of method over substance, fostered by many text-books, and to the failure of teachers of history to hold frequent conferences with

others. The teacher should especially endeavor to develop the art of narration, and to arouse enthusiasm at an impressionable age.

Mr. Isaac O. Winslow, principal of a school in Providence, regarded the committee's plans as impracticable and too ambitious. The amount of work he considered as far too great. It would be better to have fewer details, to select a few large centres of interest and emphasize them. Qualitatively also the work proposed is too difficult. Pupils of sixth-grade age are not interested in tracing the origins of American institutions in European history; for them history is still largely a moral subject and its basis should be biography. It would be better, he thought, to devote the sixth and seventh years to American history, taking up European history with its American connections in the eighth year. Tested under average conditions he believed the scheme would not prove practicable. Dr. James Sullivan of the High School of Commerce, New York City, declared, on the other hand, that the plan marked an important forward step in that it gave the pupil some idea of European history, presented American history as part of world-history, thus inculcating a truer patriotism than mere jingoism, eliminated what was unimportant, and made a most wise selection of historical personages for biographical treatment.

An open impromptu discussion followed. Professor James announced that in the completed report of the committee due attention to geography, civics, literature and art in their relations to history would be provided for; and that the work laid down for the first five grades, and especially for the fourth and fifth, would have to do with American life or American heroes. Mr. A. P. Walker of the Boston Normal School emphasized anew the doctrine that no vivid interest can be aroused and maintained in the minds of immature pupils by merely going over somewhat more intensively a field already covered. Care would need to be exercised that teachers of lower grades should not appropriate subjects belonging to the upper grades. The plan in his opinion did not cover too much ground provided a proper method of exclusion were adopted. Dr. Ernest F. Henderson thought that the plan provided too much American history. He proposed a four-year course in modern history, dealing in successive years with German, French, English and American history. It is expected that the final report of the committee will be published in the course of the year 1907.

Upon the evening of the same day occurred a joint session held with the American Economic Association, at which two papers in economic history were read. The first was that of Professor

Ulysses G. Weatherly of Indiana State University on "Babeuf's Place in the History of Socialism." The French Revolution was not entirely a movement of the middle classes. The Jacobins tended towards community of property, and their fall in 1793 replaced the middle classes in power. Babeuf and his fellow-conspirators in 1795 were tried upon political charges and the economic character of their conspiracy remained in the background. Babeuf was released from prison in October, 1795, and immediately set about to establish a communistic system. His newspaper, the *Tribun du Peuple*, began to attack the existing system of ownership of property, and the capitalistic organization of industry. The Society of the Pantheon was organized to spread communistic principles, and lasted until 1796 when Babeuf was again arrested. Babeuf and his followers were too busy contending for their political principles to evolve a plan of a social system. The general principles of their plan were outlined in the *Analysis of the Doctrine of Babeuf*. Needs, not productive power, should determine the distribution of commodities. Babeuf's system, though communistic, was based upon the principles of modern scientific socialism. His belief that socialism was the only proper system justified revolution. Babeufism was the logical result of the principles of Rousseau, Robespierre and Saint Just. Babeuf's death in 1797 marked not only the disappearance of the last of the Jacobins, but that of the leader of revolutionary socialism as well. His movement was the logical predecessor of the revolutionary outbreak of 1830, and his doctrines were largely responsible for the later outbreak.

The second paper, by Professor Edwin F. Gay of Harvard University, led a discussion of "Some Recent Theories concerning the Stages of Economic Development." He reviewed the discussions of Roscher, Hildebrand, Knies, Marx, Rodbertus, Schmoller, and Bücher, but devoted most attention to Bücher's system, which has practically displaced all of the others. Bücher's system of economic stages is purely static in character, and takes no account of social forces. The system has not been fitted to the facts, but the facts to the system; it cannot be applied either to European or to American economic development. The scheme was developed with reference to Germany, and does not fit other countries. Bücher's separable generalizations, however, correspond roughly to historical events.

Miss Katharine Coman, professor in Wellesley College, criticized the existing theories of economic stages as being too narrow, and emphasized the view that any adequate exposition of the

course of industrial evolution, so complex are the phenomena, would require not one but a series of formulae. The world-encompassing transportation agencies have made the thread of sequence difficult to follow. Beyond a mere verbal analogy to the processes of biological growth economic evolution is not organic; sequence of forms is not inevitable. Yet human society is being progressively industrialized, and industrial progress is determined by the survival of the most efficient. Environment exercises always an important influence on the course of economics, and in our country the determining conditions have been free land and the absence of legislative restraint. The transitions have been remarkably rapid. Notwithstanding these disturbing forces—cheap and rapid transportation, world-commerce, and rapid transitions—the course of economic evolution in this country may be quite clearly traced. Professor Bogart of Princeton University disagreed with what he thought to be Professor Gay's view that correct historical generalizations of historical development are impossible. Existing schemes of economic stages might be incorrect, but all such schemes he thought of value for certain purposes. He thought it possible to find some broader generalizations which should be both correct and useful. Professor Richard T. Ely of the University of Wisconsin thought man's power over nature the true principle for the tracing of economic development. A classification so based is not absolute, but is helpful and convenient. Professor Gay closed the discussion. He thought that to posit economic stages was useful, but feared that hard and fast stages and classifications might dominate too much.

In the next forenoon two conferences were simultaneously held. The one, intended to serve the interests of college teachers, had as its topic "The Sequence of College Courses in History"; the other was a conference on the special problems of state and local historical societies. The former was presided over by Professor Max Farrand of Leland Stanford University, who described the order of courses provided in that institution. It begins with a series of introductory courses covering all the chief fields of general history, which must be taken in the first or second year of college. There is also what is called a library course, likewise to be taken in one or the other of these years, which is intended to give the student some preliminary knowledge of the means by which more elaborate studies should be conducted. After these courses the student must take one advanced course in history, to be pursued in detail, without taking which he cannot be graduated in history.

Professor George B. Adams of Yale University discussed frankly

the experiments made in the historical curriculum at that institution and their good and bad results. But one course is offered, he said, in the freshman year, a general introductory course in the medieval and modern history of western Europe. Experience had shown that the demand in the second year was for general courses, covering broad fields, rather than for more special courses, the fields of which were somewhat restricted. A course covering the whole of English history has been found best to meet this demand, while in the junior and senior years a free elective system prevails.

Professor A. C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago remarked that while a fixed sequence of studies after a general introductory course may be advisable, there are many difficulties in preparing any rigid scheme, especially if the arrangement is made to depend only on the location and extent of the periods that may be selected. The guiding principle of the order of courses ought not to be the choice of fields for their own sakes. Any sequence to be useful and helpful must be based on the purpose of bringing the student gradually into a fuller appreciation of what history is and what its methods are. The chiefest aim in any arrangement must be to bring the students into intellectual sympathy with history as a branch of modern developing knowledge and to give them the historical spirit, perspective, and a knowledge—not of full technical detail to be sure—but a reasonable knowledge of the essentials of historical criticism and construction.

Professor H. Morse Stephens of the University of California adverted to the differences of method which must be caused by the varying numbers of men and women in various institutions. The women students study history in order to become teachers of that subject, while the men most commonly intend to specialize in law or journalism later. Teachers must therefore differentiate sharply between the order and method employed in the instruction of men and those pursued with women. Professor Charles D. Hazen of Smith College urged that the ability of any particular student to pursue with profit a given course depended more upon his maturity than upon such preparation as might be offered by introductory courses. Thus, he said, the sequence may vary with every student, and he advocated a high degree of flexibility in the requirements. Professor Munro of Wisconsin related that at the University of Wisconsin a system of majors with a bachelor thesis obtains, and that a student who holds his major in history must take twenty-six semester-hours. In the freshman year three courses are open: ancient, medieval, and English history. In the following years all

the courses are open, subject to certain restrictions. Professor Burr of Cornell said that, other things being equal, he believed the chronological order to be the sensible one, and that at Cornell it is made the possible one. This point was emphasized by Professor C. H. Haskins, who stated that at Harvard the students, left free in their choice of studies, ordinarily and naturally follow a chronological order if given a fair chance. Professor Theodore C. Smith of Williams made a plea for the needs of the college as distinguished from the university in the teaching of history, while Professor Herbert D. Foster gave an account of co-operative teaching at Dartmouth, and Professor Albert B. White of the University of Minnesota stated that at that institution it was insisted upon that a student should have taken a course in English history before entering upon the study of American history.

The conference on the problems of state and local historical societies was presided over by Professor Benjamin F. Shanbaugh, of the State University of Iowa. Two subjects were discussed, "Problems relative to the care and preservation of public archives", and "The marking of historical sites". Professor Herman V. Ames of the University of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Association's Public Archives Commission, was the first speaker and presented a review of the work of that commission during the seven years of its existence. The purpose of the Commission has been two-fold, to contribute information, in the form of printed reports, relative to the historical material in public archives, and to stimulate state and local governments to the proper care of such material. Forty reports, of which thirty-one have been published, have been prepared on the archives of twenty-nine states. It has been shown that hardly one of the older states has preserved complete files of its records, although the eastern states are better off in this respect than most of the others. There is however a very encouraging movement in those states where the need is greatest, for the proper care of public records. In Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Iowa, the state archives are being provided for in accordance with recent legislation. In Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut attention has been directed to the care of local archives. Professor Ames concluded his report with mentioning two additional activities undertaken by the Commission: the selection by a sub-committee of the material in the British archives to be transcribed for the Library of Congress, and the preparation of a bibliography of the official pub-

lished records of the original thirteen states to 1789, and of such local records as have been printed in any of the states.

Mr. Luther R. Kelker, custodian of public records for the state of Pennsylvania, described the work which he has done in that office since his appointment in 1903, and the principles which he has followed in the arrangement of the material confided to him. Beside such work of arrangement, he has prepared copy for the fifth and sixth series of the Pennsylvania Archives. Mr. Clayton Torrence of the Virginia State Library described the archives of that state, including the portions which are in charge of the library, the land-office, the office of the secretary of state and the other executive offices, and the work which is being done toward putting them in order and making their contents available to historical students. In 1906 the Department of Archives and History was established, in charge of Mr. H. J. Eckenrode. The early petitions and other legislative papers have been sorted, and a calendar of the petitions is now in preparation. Mr. Torrence dwelt also on the county archives, the progressive losses of these treasures by fire, and the need of better treatment of the problems connected with them. Mr. John C. Parish of the State University of Iowa spoke of the work which has lately been carried on in connection with the public archives of that state, under the direction of Professor Shambaugh, and especially described the system of classification which has been adopted. The unprinted material is first classified according to three periods: the territorial, that of the first state constitution, and that of the present constitution (since 1857). For each of these the classification is according to the various offices from which the papers respectively emanated, then in subdivisions according to the external character of the documents (letters, reports, accounts, vouchers, etc.), then in still further subdivisions of a topical sort, in each of which the arrangement is chronological. It is proposed to issue calendars of various classes and to prepare a catalogue and an index to the whole mass. Mr. Worthington C. Ford, chief of the division of manuscripts in the Library of Congress, spoke briefly of the effect of sunlight on manuscripts exposed for exhibition or for other purposes, and described an ingenious device which, with the aid of the Bureau of Standards at Washington, he had prepared for measuring the extent of such damage.

The consideration of the marking of historic sites was opened by Professor Henry E. Bourne of Western Reserve University, in a paper in which he discussed the utility of such procedure

both in awakening patriotic feeling and in making the course of historic events more intelligible. The General Committee, of which he is chairman, had sent out questionnaires and attempted to secure a systematic body of information as to what had been done and was being done in this direction. He summarized the results of this inquiry, mentioning, as examples of the work going forward, that of the committee on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Medford, Massachusetts, that of the Germantown Site and Relic Society, that of the New York History Club, the marking of scenes of the Sioux War by the Minnesota Valley Society, the appropriation of fifteen hundred dollars by the General Assembly of Rhode Island for expenditure of this sort under the direction of the Rhode Island Historical Society, the military parks established by the United States government, and the work of various of the "patriotic-hereditary" societies. Fuller statements, of much interest, were made by Miss Jane Meade Welch of Buffalo on the work of the Niagara Frontier Landmarks Association, and by Miss Zoe Adams on the marking of the old Santa Fé Trail by the Kansas Daughters of the American Revolution, aided by the state, and on the interesting investigations which were undertaken for determining the route.

The sixth and seventh sessions of the Association, those of Friday evening and Saturday morning, December 28 and 29, were devoted to the reading of papers, the business meeting of the Association having been held on Friday afternoon. In the sixth session, devoted to the earlier portions of American history, four papers were read. We speak of three, for the fourth, that of Professor Claude H. Van Tyne of the University of Michigan, on "Sovereignty in the American Revolution", appears on later pages of the present number of this journal.

Miss Susan M. Kingsbury of Simmons College, reader of the first paper, entitled "A Comparison of the Virginia Company with the other English Trading Companies of the Seventeenth Century", endeavored to lead attention away from the study of the colonial movements associated with the name of the Virginia Company to the consideration of its composition as a trading organization. This was the aspect it chiefly bore to its founders and members. The writer entered upon a comparison of its organization and operations with those of some of the other English trading companies of the time. No less than thirty such were chartered in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but there are hardly more than half a dozen whose records are preserved and accessible in

such quantities as to make comparisons fruitful. Of these we may name the Merchant Adventurers, the Eastland Company, the Muscovy, Levant, and East India companies. Miss Kingsbury instituted comparisons between the Virginia Company and these, and also, so far as possible, the Providence Island Company, in respect to organization of the former as a joint stock corporation, its arrangements for the division of land and for returns from the joint stock, its instructions to outgoing agents and to the managers of its industrial enterprises, its financial system and the pecuniary result of its endeavors both in the period of large expenditures under Sir Thomas Smythe, and in the period of Sir Edwin Sandys, when company expenditures were less but were extensively supplemented by investments in minor associations subsidiary to the company itself. Miss Kingsbury properly emphasized the need, if this large trading movement is to be comparatively studied, of completer access to the copious bodies of materials for the history of the Royal African Company, the Providence Island Company, the Levant Company, and several others.

The paper which followed, by Professor Barrett Wendell of Harvard University, was of a general character, endeavoring to suggest the specific differences which distinguish three varieties of New England character—those centring in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut. All these have their origin, he held, in the English character of the early seventeenth century, which brought to Massachusetts two incompatible tendencies—those of Protestantism, or the right of the individual to freedom from spiritual control, and of ecclesiastical system, in the peculiar form which this assumed in the early churches of New England. The typical character of Massachusetts, he suggested, has resulted from an unbroken conflict between these tendencies; while the typical character of Rhode Island has resulted from the dominant development of the Protestant tradition; and that of Connecticut from the dominant development of the ecclesiastical. Accordingly, the individuals of Massachusetts have been somewhat more distinctly developed; and the types of Rhode Island and of Connecticut have been, on the whole, more strongly pronounced. In illustration, he cited the character of Edwards, a native of Connecticut; Channing, a native of Rhode Island; and Emerson, a native of Massachusetts. Edwards, the greatest spiritual force produced by America in the eighteenth century, was the best exponent of complete divine authority; Channing stood as no other man for individual liberty within the limits of order; Emerson cast aside all

semblance of authority and stood for the greatest degree of individualism. The conflict which has prevailed in Massachusetts has made impossible the tenacity of type found in Rhode Island and Connecticut, a tenacity which has tended to prevent the development of striking personalities. For this reason the greatest literary figures of New England—Longfellow, Holmes, Whittier, Lowell, Hawthorne, Emerson—are all of Massachusetts. Such divergences as have been noted are what has made New England as a whole a vital, animating force in the life of the nation.

Next followed a paper by Mr. George L. Beer of Columbia University on "The Colonial Policy of Great Britain, 1760-1765". The general formula which in the eighteenth century summed up the reciprocal duties of Great Britain and the American colonies was that the former owed protection, the latter obedience. Protection, as quoted in the formula above, meant, in the main, naval defense; obedience signified, in general, conformity with those laws passed by Parliament in the interest of the empire as a whole. The course of events up to 1760 made imperative a reform in the colonial system of defense and a stricter enforcement of the laws of trade and navigation. The English colonial administration, therefore, directed its energies toward readjusting the laws of trade to the new conditions, toward encouraging the production in the colonies of products which Great Britain had to buy from competing European nations and, in general, toward increasing the mutual economic dependence of mother-country and colony. Measures were adopted with a view to stopping all illegal trade and to checking the purchase of French West Indian products by continental colonies. The new policy involved a reform of the customs service, the establishment of admiralty courts, the extension of British control over the Indian trade, and the imposition of Parliamentary taxes. This last part of the policy was carried out by enforcing, in a modified form, the molasses act of 1732, by laying duties on imports, and by passing a stamp act. By these measures enough revenue was raised to defray about one-third of the cost of the military establishment necessary for the protection of the colonies. The policy at once met with opposition, because the removal of the French from Canada had had the effect of making the colonies more independent, and this feeling became more and more apparent until the attempt on the part of the government to extend its administrative control over the colonies met with a decided check.

The final session, occupied with five papers on the later periods

of American history, was opened by Mr. Clarence S. Brigham, librarian of the Rhode Island Historical Society, with a contribution on "The Impressment of Seamen preceding the War of 1812". The conflicting orders of the English government and of Napoleon having thrown the carrying-trade into the hands of neutrals, British sailors rushed to man the American ships to such an extent that Gallatin declared them to constitute 2,500 out of 4,200 of the annual increase of the American marine. The right of impressment, ancient and in England undoubted, was in America regarded with feelings differing on party lines, in its application to the recovery of British sailors, or alleged British sailors, found on American ships. Judicial opinions on both sides of the ocean mostly upheld the rightfulness of such impressment, but the American executive denied it. Few sailors had been naturalized by the required five years' residence. The act of May 1796 provided for "protection papers", or certificates of citizenship. Four registers of these, from the Providence custom-house, have lately been acquired by the Rhode Island Historical Society. But such papers were shamelessly exchanged and otherwise abused. The speaker estimated that from ten to twenty thousand British sailors were serving on American vessels before the outbreak of war.

The second paper was by Professor Edward Channing on William Penn. The name of Penn, said Professor Channing, is one of the greatest of the seventeenth century, and his career has been studied most minutely. The charges of Macaulay have been refuted to the satisfaction of all investigators, yet there are some things in the career of Penn that are hard to understand. His attitude in the boundary disputes of Pennsylvania has frequently been misunderstood. Penn regarded his colony as a holy experiment in government but also, it should be remembered, as a great domain for himself. Two centres of colonial activity offered themselves in Pennsylvania, the valleys of the Delaware and the Susquehanna. Through the latter Penn desired to tap the northern fur-trade and with that in view sent agents to Albany to buy land from the Indians. His plans however were frustrated by Governor Dongan of New York, who maintained that the Iroquois were tributary to that colony, and who took a deed from the chiefs in his own name. In the south Penn was opposed by Baltimore, who claimed everything below the Schuylkill. Between the two Penn seemed likely to lose a large part of his grant. In addition to these territorial disputes Penn was beset with difficulties in the government of his colony. He was an idealist,

he desired to found a Quaker colony, yet was determined to have freedom of religion for all. Very probably a Quaker colony could have got along without laws, but non-Quakers, of whom there was a considerable influx, could not be dealt with in the Quaker meeting. Penn held that the end of government is the good of the people, that governments depend on men rather than men on government. This, it should be noted, was his idea before he had been a governor. He was a man of the highest ideals and the noblest intuitions, whose mind, however, was not fitted by nature or training to cope with practical problems of government or of business. The constitution which he made was an utter failure. This failure may be attributed to two causes. In the first place, his plan of government took away from the more numerous branch of the legislative body the right of amendment, and, a more vital defect still, denied to them also the privilege of initiation or even of discussion. The constitution which superseded the second Frame of Government and which proceeded from divided and unknown authorship remained a part of the organic law of Pennsylvania until the year 1776. How much of this constitution grew out of the idealistic notions of William Penn and how much proceeded from the experience of practical Pennsylvania politicians can never be determined because of the imperfections of the records bearing upon the subject.

The third paper of the morning, "Gustav Koerner, a Typical German-American Leader", by Professor E. B. Greene of the University of Illinois, was a biographical sketch intended to illustrate one phase of the colonization of America in the nineteenth century. The influence of the German colonists has been strongest in the Middle West, and in Cincinnati and St. Louis it has been decisive. In Illinois before the war the relation of the German element to the slavery contest was an important factor. One of the most interesting of the German communities in Illinois as early as the thirties was Belleville, whose leading citizen for half a century was the subject of this sketch. Koerner was born in Frankfort on the Main in 1809. His father was strongly anti-Napoleonic in sentiment and was in personal relations with Blücher and Stein. The son thus grew up in an atmosphere of liberalism the effects of which were strengthened by his education at Jena, where he was a member of the Burschenschaft, and at Munich, and Heidelberg. He took part in the July revolution of 1830, was present at the Hambach Festival, and, soon after his admission to the bar, took a leading part in the Frankfort insurrection of 1833. In this uprising he was wounded

and captured but made his escape and very shortly thereafter came to the United States. It was his intention to settle in Missouri but his dislike of slavery determined him in favor of Illinois. After a short law course at Transylvania University he was admitted to the bar at Vandalia and soon became one of the leading lawyers in southern Illinois. In politics he allied himself with the Democratic party, believing the Whigs to be tainted with Native-Americanism. In 1842 he was elected to the legislature and from 1845 to 1848 was on the supreme bench, resigning because of the insufficient salary. He was much interested in the European revolution of 1848 and prepared an address from the Belleville Germans which was sent to Germany urging the establishment of a republican government. He opposed the radical movement among the Germans which followed the influx of refugees about 1850 and which had for its purpose the demanding of special recognition of the Germans in America. In 1852 he was elected lieutenant-governor and came into close relations with Douglas, with whom he travelled making campaign speeches. When it became evident that the Democratic party would divide over slavery, Koerner transferred his allegiance from Douglas to Trumbull and contributed largely to the latter's election. In 1856, when the Republican party repudiated Native-Americanism, he joined its ranks and was a member of the convention of 1860. During the war he helped to raise troops, was military adviser to the governor of Illinois, was appointed to Fremont's staff, and was later made minister to Spain. During Grant's administration he went into the liberal wing of the Republican party and was a candidate for governor of Illinois. In the Hayes-Tilden campaign, however, he became a Democrat once more and was not again in public life.

The fourth paper, by Professor F. H. Hodder of the University of Kansas, dealt with "Some Aspects of the English Bill", the measure upon which the House and Senate compromised respecting the Lecompton constitution and the statehood of Kansas. The English bill provided that the Lecompton constitution should be resubmitted to the people of Kansas with the land-ordinance which had accompanied the constitution considerably amended. In case of the failure of Kansas to accept the constitution with the new ordinance, it was provided that the admission of the territory should be postponed until its population should be equal to the unit of Congressional representation. The bill was vigorously denounced at the time as a swindle and an attempt at bribing the people of Kansas with a grant of land. This view has been upheld by such

historians as Von Holst, Schouler, and Rhodes, but a careful study of the measure shows that such a view is not justified. The bill presented two issues, the constitution and the ordinance, and the conference committee endeavored to emphasize the latter and minor issue while minimizing the former which was really the more important. As a matter of fact the land-grant provided for in the bill was modelled after the corresponding section of the enabling act for Minnesota passed the year before, and was identical with the grant actually made to Kansas upon its admission in 1861. It has been the custom moreover to make grants of land upon the admission of new states, and while the amount has varied the grants of later years have generally been larger than the one in question. Finally any appearance of a bribe was removed by the fact that the grant provided for in the bill was actually smaller than the amount demanded in the ordinance accompanying the Lecompton constitution. More important than the matter of the land-grant was the provision in the bill that in case Kansas should fail to accept the terms thus offered the whole question of statehood should be postponed until the territory should have a population equal to the unit of Congressional representation. This has been regarded as a threat but is so reasonable as a matter of principle that there seems to be but small occasion to denounce it; at present it is customary to require a population equal to twice the unit of representation.

The concluding paper of the session, that of Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University, on "The Attitude of Thaddeus Stevens toward the Conduct of the Civil War", appears in full in a subsequent part of the present number of this journal.

It remains to speak of the annual business meeting, always one of the most interesting portions of the session, to those who appreciate or take part in the varied activities which mark the progress of the Association throughout the intervals between meetings. In the annual report of the Executive Council the most important passage was that which dealt with the problems connected with the Association's publications and particularly with the readjustments made necessary by the reduced appropriation by Congress, or (more exactly, so far as the present year is concerned) allotment by the Smithsonian Institution, of \$5,000 for the printing of the Annual Report.¹ It has been impossible under the appropriation for the current fiscal year to provide for gratuitous distribution to the members of volume two of the Report for 1905, which is now in press;

¹ The Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of March 3, 1907, increases the appropriation (in a sense, restores it) to \$7,000 for the ensuing fiscal year.

at a later time the members will be notified that they can procure copies of this volume at cost from the Public Printer. It consists of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *Bibliography of American Historical Societies*. Provision has also been made for the separate printing of Mr. David S. Muzzey's monograph on "The Spiritual Franciscans", which was awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams prize in December 1905, but which by reason of its ecclesiastical character was debarred by the Smithsonian Institution from publication.

The Council also reported that it had found it necessary to reorganize the Committee on Publications so as to include the chairmen of the three committees which furnish the greater part of the material for the annual volume, and to instruct the committee to consider carefully the amount and distribution of space in the Annual Report, so as to bring the cost of the Report within the amount appropriated by Congress. On recommendation of the Council the Association voted to hold the meeting of 1907 in Madison, Wisconsin, and the meeting of 1908 in Richmond, Virginia, with one day's session in Washington, provided satisfactory arrangements can be made with the railroads for rates from Washington. Professor George B. Adams, it was announced, had been re-elected by the Council as a member of the Board of Editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, for the term ending January 1, 1913.

No action of the Association was taken with a more cordial unanimity and none has been received with more hearty commendations by the public press than the election of Mr. James Bryce, upon the proposal of the Council, to honorary membership in the Association. The Association has in its whole history had but four honorary members: first Ranke, then Stubbs and Gardiner and Mommsen. It was felt that the new British ambassador had claims of the highest kind to any honor which the Association could offer him.

The treasurer's report showed net receipts of \$8,490, net expenses of \$7,534, an increase of about \$950 in the funds of the Association, and total assets of \$24,189.

The secretary of the Pacific Coast Branch reported upon its work for the past year and particularly on the third annual meeting held at Portland, Oregon, on November 30 and December 1.

The chairman of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, Dr. J. F. Jameson, reported that the appropriation for the year 1906 had been consumed in the completion of the work on the diplomatic archives of the Republic of Texas, undertaken by the preceding commission, and that it had not been practicable to take up new enter-

prizes until that work had been disposed of. The chairman of the Public Archives Commission, Professor Herman V. Ames, reported that the commission had prepared for publication in the Annual Report for 1906 reports on the state (or in some cases local) archives of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia, a bibliography of the published archive-material of the thirteen original states from the beginning of the colonial period to 1789, and a summary of recent legislation by the states for the care and supervision of state and local archives. It had also arranged for the continuance of the work of selecting and copying documents in England relating to America, under the direction of a sub-committee, of which Professor Charles M. Andrews is chairman.

The Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize announced the award of that prize to Miss Annie Heloise Abel, of the faculty of the Women's College of Baltimore, for her monograph on "The History of Events resulting in Indian Consolidation west of the Mississippi River". The Association voted to adopt the committee's recommendation that the prize be henceforth \$200 instead of \$100, and that it be awarded biennially, beginning with December, 1908. The Association also voted, on the joint recommendation of the committees on the Adams and Winsor Prizes, to define the areas to which these prizes respectively refer as follows: for the Justin Winsor Prize, American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1783, or of other territories, continental or insular, which have since been acquired by the United States, and of independent Latin America; for the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize, European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental, insular or colonial, excluding continental French America and British America before 1783.

The Committee on Bibliography reported that progress had been made upon a check-list of the chief collections of sources of European history in American libraries, and that this would doubtless be in print before the next meeting of the Association. The General Committee reported that they had begun a systematic inquiry into the marking of historic sites, which they planned to finish during the coming year. The editor of the *Original Narratives of Early American History* reported the publication of two volumes during the autumn just passed, and the expectation that another would appear in February and two more during the spring. The Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools reported, as has been mentioned above, that their final report might be expected to appear in print in the course of the year 1907.

Complimentary resolutions of the usual character were presented and passed. The committee on nominations, Messrs. A. C. McLaughlin, E. L. Stevenson and J. A. Woodburn, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Dr. J. Franklin Jameson was elected president, Professor George B. Adams first vice-president, and Professor Albert Bushnell Hart second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor C. H. Haskins and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were re-elected to their former positions. In the place of Professors Bourne and McLaughlin, who had been thrice elected to the Executive Council, Mr. Worthington C. Ford and Professor William MacDonald were chosen.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION

<i>President,</i>	J. Franklin Jameson, Washington.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Professor George B. Adams, New Haven.
<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton Street, New York.

Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew Dickson White, ¹	Professor Goldwin Smith, ¹
President James Burrill Angell, ¹	Professor John Bach McMaster, ¹
Henry Adams, Esq., ¹	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, ¹
James Schouler, Esq., ¹	Professor George P. Garrison,
Professor George Park Fisher, ¹	Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., ¹	Professor Charles M. Andrews,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., ¹	Professor James H. Robinson,
Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, ¹	Worthington C. Ford, Esq.,
Henry Charles Lea, Esq., ¹	Professor William MacDonald.

Committees:

Committee on Programme for the Twenty-third Annual Meeting: Professor Alfred L. P. Dennis, University of Wisconsin, chairman; Charles H. Haskins, Frank H. Hodder, Andrew C. McLaughlin, Frederick J. Turner, and Claude H. Van Tyne.

¹ Ex-presidents.

Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the Next Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Sociological Society: Burr W. Jones, Esq., Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; Richard T. Ely, Carl R. Fish, Dana C. Munro, Paul S. Reinsch, Edward A. Ross, R. G. Thwaites, and William F. Vilas.

Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Above Meeting: Mrs. Lucius Fairchild, Madison, Wisconsin, chairman; Mrs. William F. Allen, and Miss Ida M. Tarbell.

Editors of the American Historical Review: Professor George B. Adams, Yale University, chairman; George L. Burr, Albert Bushnell Hart, J. Franklin Jameson, Andrew C. McLaughlin, and William M. Sloane.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution of Washington, chairman; Edward G. Bourne, Worthington C. Ford, Frederick W. Moore, Thomas M. Owen, and James A. Woodburn.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Professor Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, chairman; Edward P. Cheyney, Evarts B. Greene, John H. Latané, and Williston Walker.

Public Archives Commission: Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Clarence S. Brigham, Carl R. Fish, Herbert L. Osgood, Dunbar Rowland, and Robert T. Swan.

Committee on Bibliography: Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Appleton P. C. Griffin, William C. Lane, Victor H. Paltsits, James T. Shotwell, and Wilbur H. Siebert.

Committee on Publications: Professor William A. Dunning, Columbia University, chairman; Herman V. Ames, A. Howard Clark, Charles H. Haskins, J. Franklin Jameson, and Ernest C. Richardson.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman; George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James W. Thompson, and John M. Vincent. (During the absence of Professor Gross in Europe after June 1, 1907, Professor Burr will act as chairman.)

General Committee: Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, State University of Iowa, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, Earle W. Dow, Charles H. Haskins, Frank H. Hodder, Susan M. Kingsbury, Franklin L. Riley, Lucy M. Salmon, Frank H. Severance, and Frederick G. Young.

Finance Committee: James H. Eckels and Peter White.

Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools: Professor James A. James, Northwestern University, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Eugene C. Brooks, Wilbur F. Gordy, Mabel Hill, Julius Sachs, Henry W. Thurston, and J. H. Van Sickle.

Conference of State and Local Historical Societies: Frank H. Severance, Buffalo Historical Society, chairman; Evarts B. Greene, secretary.

SOME ENGLISH CONDITIONS SURROUNDING THE SETTLEMENT OF VIRGINIA

To Americans the settlement of Jamestown presents itself as something unique, the birth of the nation, the first scene in the drama of American history. Looked at from the European side, however, it was but a single occurrence connected with a long line of preceding events and surrounded by a group of others with which it had mutual relations. Under the conditions existing in England at the beginning of the seventeenth century the establishment of the Virginia colony was the natural next step to take, and its form reflected the group of influences active there. In these times of reminiscence it may be of interest to examine more closely some of the steps that led up to the formation of the Virginia Company and some of the contemporary circumstances under which the settlement was made.

England came late into the colonizing movement. The example of two great colonial empires had long been before her. When the settlement of 1607 took place, more than a century had passed since the nearly contemporary voyages of Vasco da Gama in 1497 and of Columbus in 1492 had established the dominion of Portugal and of Spain respectively in the East and the West Indies. In the years immediately succeeding 1497 the Portuguese government, in a wonderful series of naval and trading expeditions, extended its dominion along the coasts of the Indian Ocean far beyond what would have seemed inherently possible for so small a nation. A line of able commanders not only successfully fought Indian, Arab, and Turkish fleets and the armies of petty Indian rajahs and island chieftains, but carried out a policy of seizing and holding the strategic military and commercial ports that soon gave them virtual command of all the Eastern seas. By 1520 the east coast of Africa, the land at the outlet of the Persian Gulf, the west coast of India, the island of Ceylon, Java, and the Spice Islands were lined by a scattered series of Portuguese fortified stations, and most of the princes of these regions had been forced to accept dependent alliances with the king of Portugal. From Quiloa and Mombassa on the African coast, through Ormuz, Diu, Goa, and Calicut, to Malacca and the Spice Islands, no vessel could trade without a

Portuguese pass, no coast ruler could make a treaty antagonistic to Portugal, and all the most profitable commerce was in her hands. A Portuguese viceroy ruled at Goa, and two governors with stations at Mozambique in the west and Malacca in the east were given the oversight of the outlying parts of these 15,000 miles of coast dominion. Every year a fleet averaging twenty sail passed around the Cape of Good Hope between Portugal and her eastern dominions, its great galleons, caravels, and carracks loaded with the most valuable articles of commerce. Lisbon became a great commercial centre and Portugal enjoyed a period of unwonted intellectual, economic, and international prominence. Her king along with his other titles called himself "Lord of the Conquest, Navigation, and Commerce of Ethiopia, Arabia, Persia, and India."

The construction by Spain in the latest years of the fifteenth and the early years of the sixteenth century of a still more extended, more powerful, and more profitable empire in the West is an even more impressive if also more familiar story. By some such date as 1540 the *conquistadores* had explored and largely subjugated a great part of the island and continental regions of America south of what is now the United States. This dominion had been organized under the systematic administration of the Council of the Indies and the Casa de Contratacion in Spain and of two viceroalties with a number of subordinate governments in America. Certain municipal institutions had been established and constant communication took place with the home government. The vast geographical extent of the Spanish dominions in the New World, with a Spanish-born population of perhaps 150,000 and native-born of possibly 5,000,000; the productivity of the silver and gold-mines, unexampled before in human history; the size of the fleets, carrying between Spain and the Indies emigrants, military and civil officials, troops, bullion, European and American goods, and all the interchange of two parts of an advanced empire; the reaction of these things on the importance of the mother-country in Europe—all these, like the East-Indian empire of Portugal, had grown practically to maturity by the middle of the sixteenth century, long before England had established her first colony.

We know that the existence of these imposing political structures exercised a powerful influence on the thought of Englishmen. It was not merely that they had a natural human interest in the newly-discovered lands, with their savage men, new animal and vegetable productions, and peculiarities of climate and physical conformation; nor was it merely that the mystery, the glamor, and the romance of the distant and the unknown touched poetic imaginations amongst

them; but it was true that many Englishmen of influence had a vivid realization that two nations of Europe, one far smaller, the other not inordinately larger than England, had obtained a great inheritance in the East and the West that England might have had, might even yet rival. The very first reference to the New World in English general literature is an expression of regret and vexation on that account:

O what thyng a had be than
Yf that they that be englyshe men
Myght have ben the furst of all
That there shulde have take possessyon
And made furst buyldyng and habytacion
A memory perpetuall.
And also what an honorable thyng
Bothe to the realme and to the kyng
To have had his domynyons extendyng
There into so farre a grounde.¹

An early historian makes one party in the council of Henry VIII., as early as 1511, say, "The Indies are discover'd, and vast treasure brought from thence every day. Let us therefore bend our endeavours thitherwards; and if the Spanish and Portuguese suffer us not to join with them, there will be yet region enough for all to enjoy."² The well-known memorial sent by Robert Thorne, an English merchant resident in Seville, to Henry VIII. in 1527, after speaking of the islands and territories belonging to the kings of Spain and Portugal, declares that in some of the earlier English expeditions, "if the marriners would have been ruled, and folowed their pilot's mind the lands of the West Indies from whence all the gold commeth had beene ours", and that even yet England might find lands under the equator no less rich in gold and spicery and no less profitable to her than theirs were to the kings of Spain and Portugal.³ Richard Eden in the dedication of his *Treatyse of the New India*, published in 1553, again expresses regret that the faint-heartedness of the early English navigators prevented its coming to pass that the rich Peruvian treasury of the Spanish king at Seville was not in the Tower of London.⁴ In his *Decades of the New World*, published two years later, he refrains, naturally enough, from such a pious wish, as his book is dedicated

¹ *An Interlude of the Four Elements*, written probably in 1519; printed in E. Arber, *First Three English Books on America*, pp. xx-xxi.

² Lord Herbert of Cherbury, *History of Henry VIII.*, under the year 1511.

³ Hakluyt, II. 177.

⁴ E. Arber, *First Three English Books on America*, p. 6.

to Philip of Spain, now king also of England, but he does go so far as to say in his "Preface to the Reader":

Beside the portion of lande perteynyng to the Spanyardes and beside that which pertaineth to the Portugales, there yet remayneth an other portion of that mayne lande reachyng towards the northeast, thought to be as large as the other, and not yet knowne but only by the sea coastes, neyther inhabyted by any Christian men.

Then still more exactly indicating the very region which was destined long afterward to become Virginia and New England, he declares that it is a reproach to the English race that they who are the nearest people in Europe to that land have not attempted to christianize or occupy it, nor "to doo for owr partes as the Spaniardes have doone for theyrs, and not ever lyke sheepe to haunte one trade, and to doo nothyng woorthy memorie amonge men or thankes before god".¹

Similarly through the growing familiarity of the Englishmen with the Indies during the reign of Elizabeth runs the thought that England also should have an Indian empire. The residence of English merchants and the experience of travellers in Spanish and Portuguese cities, their home correspondence, and their translations of Spanish works on the Indies;² the productions of pamphleteers and writers of travels, culminating in the work of Hakluyt in 1589; the unwelcome visits of English adventurers to the Indies; the capture by Drake in 1587 and 1592 of the *San Felipe* and the *Madre de Dios*, the two great Portuguese carracks on their way home from the East Indies; the minute description of the Portuguese East Indies by Linschoten in his work published in England in 1598; the wide experience and thoughtful observation of many English statesmen and ambassadors—all these strengthened "imperialist" sentiment in England. Men of visionary temperament, like Sidney, Raleigh, Drake, Captain John Smith, Sir Thomas Smythe, and many humbler names among London merchants or restless adventurers, felt their imaginations stirred by the thought of distant dominions of such extent, interest, and value to the European powers that ruled them. It is not to be believed that in a period of strong national self-consciousness and increasing power, when ambition for distant possessions had been growing through more than one generation, a vigorous and effective effort to establish some such colony as Virginia could have been long delayed.

Projects indeed were early formed and colonists sent out, but their history is a record of failure. A desire for the possession

¹ Arber, p. 55.

² Underhill, *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*, chap. 5.

of a colonial empire and enthusiasm for the plantation of colonies are not enough; a practicable plan must be found.

English exploitation of America was begun on mistaken and impracticable lines. A large proportion of the expeditions that were sent from England to America in the last two decades of the sixteenth century were sent out by single individuals or small groups of individuals. The first expedition which carried men intended as settlers, that of Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1578, was a private venture of his own, with the aid of a few friends, and that on which he lost his life five years afterward was on scarcely a broader basis. The contemporary annalist, Camden, speaking of Gilbert's failure and death, says, "learning too late himself, and teaching others, that it is a difficulter thing to carry over Colonies into remote Countreys upon private mens Purses, than he and others in an erroneous Credulity had persuaded themselves, to their own Cost and Detriment".¹ Or as some one a few years later says, "Private purces are cowlde comfortes to adventurers, and have ever ben fownde fatall to all interprises hitherto undertaken by the English, by reason of delaies, jeloces and unwillingnes to backe that project which succeeded not at the first attempt."² The multiplicity and extent of costs involved in procuring and fitting out vessels, in providing military equipment and all other supplies for mariners and colonists, and in supporting employees and settlers; the long waiting for any returns; the slight development of instruments of credit—these made demands beyond the means of any individual gentleman or group of gentlemen, burdened as they already were by the living expenses of their rank. The efforts of the Gilberts, the Raleighs, and the Sidneys were along mistaken and hopeless lines. Their efforts were more useful as a warning than as an example. There is no instance of a successful settlement in America carried out by private persons till well toward the middle of the seventeenth century. Until the day when settlers for religious or economic reasons went out at their own cost, the only hope of meeting the expenses incident to founding a colony was either to draw on the resources of the whole community through the government, or to meet them by the combined means and the organized credit and effort of the merchant class. At the close of the sixteenth century the English government was not in a position financially or politically to furnish the funds for colonization, so the only remaining practical method was

¹ *History of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 287.

² "Reasons or Motives for the Raising of a Publique Stocke," sect. 5. Printed in Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, I. 37.

the formation of a trading company, with its much more extended resources and its corporate life. The £40,000 which Raleigh spent on the six or eight expeditions he sent out nearly ruined him and his friends, while the East India Company spent more than £60,000 on its first voyage to the East alone.

The true line of descent of the plan for the successful settlement of Virginia is through the early trading companies of the Old World, not through the early failures in the New. In fact the whole advance of English discovery, commerce, and colonization in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was due not to individuals but to the efforts of corporate bodies. The development of such companies is a familiar story. It began almost an even half-century before the settlement of Jamestown. In 1553 a group of London merchants sent out an expedition to the north-east to seek a new outlet for trade. As a result a line of connection was formed with Moscow in the centre of Russia, and in 1555 a charter was given to the merchants engaged in the trade, forming them into the body that had a long and influential history under the familiar name of the Muscovy Company. "Muscovy House", their hall, was long the customary meeting-place for adventurers interested in new trading movements. Twenty-five years later the merchants who were engaged in the trade with Scandinavia and the lands to the east of the Baltic Sea secured a charter guaranteeing to them the monopoly of English commerce there, and became known as the Baltic or Eastland Company. From a time early in the century other merchants had been interested in trade with Venice and the eastern Mediterranean possessions of Venice. Now they proceeded to develop a trade with the possessions of Turkey, in 1581 were chartered as the Levant or Turkey Company, and shortly afterward absorbed the smaller company trading to the northern Mediterranean.

In the meantime a Barbary or Morocco Company had been formed. Then, as an Elizabethan chronicler says, "The searching and unsatisfied spirits of the English, to the great glorie of our nation, could not be contained within the bankes of the Mediterranean or Levant seas, but that they passed far towardes both the articke and anarticke Poles, enlarging their trade into the West and East Indies".¹ English trade with the west coast of Africa was resented by the Portuguese, and in 1561 Queen Elizabeth was induced to issue the following proclamation:

Although we know no reasonable cause why our subjects may not saile into any country or province subject to our good brother, being in

¹ John Speed, *Chronicle*, II. 852.

amytic with us, paying such tributes and droytes as may belong to their traffique, yet at the instant request of the said king, made to us by his ambassador, we be pleased for this tyme to admonish all manner our subjects to forbear anie entry by navigation into any said ports of Ethiopia in which the said king hath presently dominion and tribute.¹

Many changes occurred in the next twenty-five years, and when all the possessions of the Portuguese had come into the hands of the king of Spain and war had broken out between them and the queen, there was no longer any reason for such self-restraint, so that in 1588 the first Guinea or African Company was chartered. In 1589 a petition was laid before Lord Treasurer Burleigh asking for the queen's authorization to a group of adventurers to establish a trade in the Far East, on the ground that "the Portugales of long tyme have traded the East Indies and the countries to them adjoyning to the great benefytte and enriching of themselves and their countrie . . . and the tyme doth now offer greater occazion for the attempting of trade in those countries than at any tyme heretofore yt hath done."² This project resulted in the Raymond and Lancaster expedition to India in 1591 and ultimately in the establishment in 1600 of the East India Company, the most ambitious of all the chartered companies of the period.

In the same year with this petition, however, that is to say 1589, a memorial of even greater boldness, breadth of view, and interest was submitted to the queen. It is headed, "A Discourse of the Commoditie of the taking of the Straight of Magellan." It is based on the anticipated peril to all Europe arising from the possession of both the West and the East Indies by the king of Spain and his shutting other nations entirely out from both their products and their trade. It proposes that the narrowest part of the Strait of Magellan be occupied and fortified by the English, calmly suggesting that "Clarke the pyrott" may be sent there on promise of pardon, or rather, may "go there as of him selfe and not with the countenance of the English state", and take some cannon and a man skilled in fortification. If later a few good English soldiers are placed there, no doubt "they will soon make subject to them all the golden mines of Peru and all the coste and tract of that firm of America." As additions to the soldiers and the native population may be sent "condemned Englishmen and women in whom there may be found hope of amendment". Then the author contemplates, probably for the first time, an independent America. "But admitt that we could

¹ Dyson, *Proclamations*, No. 34.

² State Papers, East Indies, I., No. 8.

³ State Papers, Dom., Eliz., ccxix, 97.

not enjoy the same longe, but that the Englishe there would aspire to government of themselves, yet were it better that it should be soe then that the Spaniardes should with the treasure of that countrie torment all the countries of Europe with warres." This and much more equally audacious and impracticable brought no response from the thrifty and cautious powers then in charge of the English government. And indeed such a project is to be looked upon rather as an indication of the expansive spirit of England than as a proposal anywhere within the realm of success.

Thus the century and the reign of Elizabeth closed without the possession by England of a foothold on the western continent. Yet the way was obvious. Six chartered commercial companies had divided most of the available Old World between them; next to be chartered was the Virginia Company. In fact the three next succeeding companies, the Guiana, the Newfoundland, and the Bermuda Companies, established in 1609, 1610, and 1612 respectively, all had their sphere of operation in America. The connection of the older companies with the Virginia Company was very close. More than one hundred members of the Virginia Company were already members of the East India Company. Sir Thomas Smythe was at the same time governor of both the Muscovy and the East India Companies, a member of the Levant Company, and treasurer of the Virginia Company. John Eldred, a director, and Sir William Ronney, a governor of the East India Company, were members of the first council of Virginia. Richard Staper, who is described on his tombstone in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, as "the cheefest actor in the discoverie of the trades of Turkey and East India", was much interested in the Virginia project, but died in June, 1608, just too soon to have his name inscribed with the others on the second charter. The same connection existed in the case of Sir Edwin Sandys, Sir Thomas Roe, and many others. There was also a distinct lapping over in time. The second charter of the Virginia Company was signed on the twenty-third and the second charter of the East India Company on the thirty-first of May, 1609. The vessels for the third voyage to India and those for the first voyage to Virginia were both loading at the wharves of London at the same time; and the two ships of one of the expeditions of the Muscovy Company had returned to Gravesend but three months before the first Virginian fleet left it.

Close however as was the connection of the Virginia Company with preceding trading companies, in many ways the closest analogy with its action and its nearest congener among the movements of the time is to be found in the plantation of Ireland then in progress.

An English colony had been established in Ireland in the twelfth century, and additional settlers had come from England and Wales during the thirteenth and the earliest years of the fourteenth century, but after that time immigration had with small exceptions come to an end.¹ This "first colonization" had however been largely absorbed into the native population or had returned to England, and the end of the fifteenth century had seen the English occupation and domination in Ireland reduced to its lowest limits. Within the sixteenth and the early seventeenth century, however, a great reaction took place, first in the government, which became more vigorous and extended its power more widely in the island; then in the population, into which with great labor an English and Scottish element was injected. The colonization of Ireland with Britons may indeed be looked on as largely a part of the political policy of the government. The maintenance of an armed body in Ireland was an expensive necessity; if this could be provided by the military services exacted from a body of English settlers, money would be saved and the end more effectively reached. Again, the evident failure to induce the native population or the old English element to abandon Catholicism made it highly desirable for political reasons to introduce a Protestant element from the outside. Since the only conception of orderly government which English statesmen of the time could form was the system already in existence in England, with its county and parish administration, its justices of the peace, grand and petty juries, and town corporations; and since these could only be counted on to act in accordance with the desires of the administration if they were made up of Englishmen and Protestants, this requirement made a still further need for settlers. Therefore the government was more than ready to respond to the enterprise, the adventurous spirit, and the acquisitiveness of the times; and as a matter of fact an extensive colonization by English and Scots took place nearly if not quite contemporary with the earliest settlement of America.

There was much that was alike in the two movements. The simultaneity of dates is striking. It is true that in Ireland the process began sooner, but these first efforts were hardly more successful than the tentative sixteenth-century settlements in America. In 1566 a "plantation" was begun in Leix and Offaly in the centre of Ireland in the lands of the O'Mores and O'Conors, far earlier than any definite project of English settlement in America was mooted, unless it were Stukely's plan for the settlement of Florida in 1563 and the

¹ Bonn, *Die Englische Kolonisation in Irland*, I. 83-89; *English Historical Review*, October, 1906, p. 774.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII.—34.

suggestions for colonization included in Gilbert's pamphlets of 1565. But this colonization in Ireland went forward very haltingly, and it was not till the very close of the century that the few English settlers had permanently taken the place of the natives.¹ There was also a series of attempts at settlements in the southwestern counties in 1569 and in the northeast in 1567, 1570, and 1573, but the native Irish were too strong and the intruding elements too weak to gain success as settlers.² The most direct parallel to the efforts at American settlement by Gilbert and Raleigh between 1578 and 1588 is to be found in the plantation of Munster, which was begun in 1584. Extensive grants were at that time made to Raleigh, Spenser, and other courtiers, and detailed conditions were published by which these and other broad lands confiscated from the natives were to be occupied by English adventurers and their tenants. But there were many difficulties, the colonization proceeded slowly; in 1592 only two hundred and forty-five English families could be found actually settled there; in 1598 even these were temporarily swept away in the storm of Tyrone's rebellion, and in 1602 Raleigh disposed of his grant in disgust. Munster was provided with a certain number of new settlers, but they were almost lost among the surviving native population.

The English colonization of Ireland that really succeeded, like the successful colonization of Virginia, occurred in the early years of the seventeenth century. In the fall of 1605 Sir Arthur Chichester, Lord Deputy, was formulating the first plans for an extensive settlement of the lately forfeited lands in Ulster; and at the same time Gates, Somers, and others were drawing up the petition which led to the grant of the first charter of the Virginia Company; Weymouth had just returned from New England; and the populace of London was laughing at the jests on the Virginia voyagers, on Captain Seagull and the Scotchmen in *Eastward Hoe*. The year 1606 saw the first settlement of County Down and the continued occupation of Antrim by Scotchmen,³ and the departure from London on December 30 of the first colonists of Virginia. In the years immediately following, while successive expeditions were taking out the small and unfortunate groups of early victims to the diseases, dissensions, and massacres of Virginia, steps were being taken for the plantation of Ulster on a large scale. In May, 1611, the first settlers of Ulster proper began to arrive and take up their lands. Emigration now went on to both countries alike. Ulster having

¹ Bagwell, *Ireland under the Tudors*, I. 385, etc.; Bonn, *Kolonisation*, 280-287.

² Bagwell, II., chaps. xxv.-xxxI.

³ George Hill, *The Macdonnells of Antrim*, 229, etc.; *The Montgomery Manuscripts*, 54, etc.

been at least partially populated, new plantations were carried out in Wexford, Longford, Leitrim, and Westmeath, and several parts of the old Munster settlement were recolonized, while to Virginia were added New England, Maryland, the Bermuda Islands, and other American settlements.

A bond between Virginia and Ireland is also to be found in the men who had a common interest in both. The Carews, Grenvilles, Courtenays, and Chichesters who planned a great colonizing expedition from Somerset and Devon into Ireland in 1569 were the same men who were interested in the earliest attempts to colonize America. Sir Humphrey Gilbert had been a captain in Ireland in 1566 before he presented to the queen his first address advocating colonization in America; he returned to Ireland in 1567 in an unsuccessful attempt, along with Sir Henry Sidney, to make a settlement on Lough Foyle; some years later he went again to Ireland in connection with a similar scheme for a settlement in Munster, and remained in military service in that province as colonel in the final campaign of the Desmond rising. All this occurred before he made his first voyage to America in 1578, and he was still again in Ireland between his return and his departure on his last and fatal voyage of 1583.¹

Raleigh's career had begun in Ireland, and when he abandoned his rights in Virginia in 1589 it was to return with new interest to the effort for the development of his estates in Cork and Waterford. Two years afterward, when this like the rest of the Munster plantations failed, it was again to an American project, the exploration of Guiana, that he turned. Sir John Popham took a deep interest both in the plantation of Munster and in that of Virginia. Sir Francis Bacon was similarly interested in both countries, submitting plans for the settlement of Ireland, and as solicitor-general helping to draw up the charter of 1609 for Virginia. He was also a member of the royal council for Virginia. His valuation of the settlement of Ireland was the higher of the two. In his *Considerations touching the Plantation in Ireland*, presented to King James on New Year's day, 1609, he treats the colonization of Virginia as a somewhat visionary scheme, that of Ireland as a serious reality, the former being "an enterprise in my opinion differing as much from this as Amadis de Gaul differs from Cæsar's Commentaries". At the same time he goes on to recommend the establishment of two councils for the Irish plantation, one to sit in London, the other in Ireland, similar to the two councils for Virginia; and long afterward he speaks of the plantations of Ireland and of Virginia as two of the greatest glories of King James's reign.²

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, article on Gilbert.

² Spedding, *Lord Bacon's Letters and Life*, IV. 123; VII. 175.

Other similarities existed. In the colonization of Ireland as of America, organized and chartered companies are not unknown. In 1611 the East India Company purchased certain lands near Duncannon on the southern coast of County Cork, where they erected iron-works, built dwellings for 300 workmen, cut down woods, established a ship-yard, and within the next two years spent £7,000 and built two vessels of 500 and 400 tons.¹ In 1609, after prolonged negotiation between the Privy Council and the officers of the city of London, an agreement was entered into by which the whole county of Derry in Ireland was handed over to the city, to be colonized under its control and to its profit. In order to carry out this work the "Honorable Society of the Governor and Assistants of London of the New Plantation in Ulster within the Realm of Ireland" was formed by the court of mayor and aldermen of the city, the Wardrobe in the Guildhall was set apart for its meeting-place, and a charter of incorporation granted it by the crown, May 29, 1613.² The society proceeded immediately to divide the land among the twelve city companies for sale and settlement, reserving to itself only the possession of the cities of Londonderry and Coleraine, their contiguous lands, and the woods, ferries, and fisheries.³ But this was scarcely a genuine trading company; it existed, indeed still exists, only as an intermediary between the government and the settlers. The distant commerce that lay at the basis of the other companies which carried out schemes of colonization had no place in the relations between England and Ireland, and such companies could therefore hold here hardly any appreciable place.

On the other hand, both in Ireland and in Virginia we hear much of groups or combinations of men or "consortships", formed to carry out independent settlements. It was an associated group of twenty-seven volunteers from the southwestern counties of England, under the headship of Sir Peter Carew, who in 1569 petitioned the queen for a grant of the southwestern counties of Ireland. During the colonization of Munster in 1586, we hear of "nineteen men who desire in one consort with the writer, Henry Ughtred, to plant the counties of Connollo and Kerry"; of the gentlemen of one association of Cheshire, Lancashire, Somerset, and Dorset; and of another of Hampshire and Devon.⁴ In connection with the plantation of Ulster "consorts of undertakers" are authorized, and the name of

¹ *Cal. St. Papers, Ireland, 1611-1614*, pp. 170, 369, 381.

² *A Concise View of the Origin . . . of the Governor and Assistants . . . commonly called the Irish Society* (London, 1822); *Report of Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Irish Society, May 4, 1891.*

³ *Concise View*, p. 38.

⁴ *Cal. St. Papers, Ireland, 1586-1588*, pp. 51, 242, 243.

an individual, when it appears, is often used to represent such a group.¹ The corresponding process in Virginia is described as follows in the *Records of the Virginia Company*:

The Collony being thus weake and the Treasury utterly exhaust, Itt pleased divers Lords, Knights, gentlemen and Cittizens (greived to see this great Action fall to nothings) to take the matter a new in hand and at their pryvate charges (joyninge themselves into societies) to sett upp divers particularr Plantacions.²

From this time forward a prominent part in the work of settlement in Virginia was taken by "Captain Samuel Argall and his associates", "Hamor and his associates", "Martin and his associates", "the Society of Smythe's Hundred", "the Society of Martin's Hundred", "Captain John Bargrave and his associates", "William Tracy and his associates", "the company of John Smith of Nibley", and a number of other groups of adventurers.³ Indeed, the agreement made with the Virginia Company under which the Pilgrims from Leyden sought the New World was a typical instance of these arrangements. In the fall of 1617 two representatives of this body came to London and entered into communication with the company. After long negotiations, the final grant under which the momentous voyage of the *Mayflower* was made was that to "John Pierce and his associates, their heirs and assignes", completed February 12, 1620.⁴

Some lesser analogies between the settlement of Ireland and of Virginia are noticeable. The statute *quia emptores* was suspended for the settlers in Ulster, and new manors and subtenancies could be created, as was true for Virginia and the other American colonies;⁵ there were much the same privileges of export and import for a certain period of years free of duty;⁶ the local division called a "precinct", not apparently in use in England, but rather widely spread in the southern colonies of America, was used in a similar technical sense in the north of Ireland. There is the same complaint of the low character of many of the colonists. A Presbyterian minister who came to Ulster at the beginning of the settlement says:

From Scotland came many, and from England not a few; yet all of them, generally the scum of both nations, who for debt, and breaking,

¹ *Ibid.*, 1611-1614, pp. 315, 317; Commission of July, 1609; George Hill, *Summary Sketch of the Great Ulster Plantation*, p. 18, etc.

² *Records of the Virginia Company* (1906), I. 350.

³ *Ibid.*, 347, 404, 439, etc.; Kingsbury, *Introduction to Records*, p. 95; Brown, *First Republic in America*, 245, 249, 256, etc.

⁴ Brown, 252, 262, 271, 341, 387, etc.

⁵ *Articles concerning English and Scotch Undertakers*, sect. 11; Lord Belmore, *Two Ulster Manors*, p. 66.

⁶ *Articles*, etc., sects. 14, 15; *Articles between the King and the City of London*, sect. 15.

and fleeing from justice, or seeking shelter came hither, hoping to be without fear of man's justice in a land where there was nothing, or but little as yet, of the fear of God.¹

So Sir Thomas Dale describes those whom he took over with him in 1611 as "sutch disordered persons, so prophane, so riotous, so full of mutinie and treasonable intendments, as I am well to witness in a parcell of 300 which I brought with me, of which well may I say not many give testimonie beside their names that they are Christians, besides of sutch diseased and crased bodies".² Fortunately for both settlements we have reason to know that they contained also far better elements. There is the same tendency in both colonizations to introduce that compulsion in order to secure colonists to which men so readily turned in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³

Eventually the colonization of Ireland and of the American colonies became rival movements. This opposition had been felt by some from an early period. In 1605 Sir Arthur Chichester, Lord Deputy of Ireland, wrote to the Earl of Salisbury of the absurd folly or wilful ignorance of those who run over the world in search of colonies in Virginia and Guiana whilst Ireland is lying waste and desolate.⁴ Later, in speaking of the proposed colonization of the north of Ireland, he says, "My heart is so well affected unto it that I had rather labour with my hands in the plantation of Ulster than dance or play in that of Virginia."⁵ At first the greater proximity of Ireland to Scotland and England was a point overwhelmingly in its favor; and in the second and third decades of the century, while hundreds were going to America, Irish immigration might count thousands. But there came a time when this proximity was looked upon as a disadvantage, and those emigrants who wanted to leave England at all wished to get entirely away from the mother-country. Puritans and Churchmen successively emigrated, but emigrated by preference to New England or Virginia, where the hostility of the dominant party in England had less effect than it might have in Ireland. Colonists for Ireland were never abundant. The plantations which were carried out just after that of Ulster, in the period from 1615 to 1630, and which it was intended to establish on the mountain slopes of the southeast and in the forests and bogs along the Shannon, had increasing difficulty in finding settlers.⁶ When Wentworth

¹ Rev. Andrew Stewart, in Hill, *Summary Sketch*, p. 18.

² Sir Thomas Dale to Lord Salisbury, August 17, 1611, in Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, I. 508.

³ Brown, *First Republic in America*, 248, 296, 346, 375, etc.

⁴ *Cal. St. Papers, Ireland, 1603-1606*, p. 326.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1608-1610, p. 520.

⁶ Bonn, *Kolonisation in Irland*, I. 353-357.

in the years immediately following 1630 formed plans for still another plantation, to be located in Ormond, Clare, and Connaught. it soon became evident that no English settlers were forthcoming, and Wentworth's political downfall only anticipated the certain failure of his colonizing policy.

In fact the settlement of Ireland as well as of America was necessarily limited by the amount of available population in England at the opening of the seventeenth century. A wide-spread opinion existed then that England was overpopulated, and this opinion is apparently still generally held. A tract printed in London in 1609, *A Good Speed to Virginia*, says:

God hath prospered us with the blessings of the wombe, and with the blessings of the breasts, the sword devoureth not abroad, neither is there any feare in our streetes at home; so that we are now for multitude as the thousands of Manasses and as the ten thousands of Ephraim . . . we are a great people and the lande is too narrow for us.¹

When James offered to allow his Scottish as well as his English subjects to take up lands in Ireland he explained that "There be no want of great numbers of the country people of England who with all gladness would transport themselves and their families to Ireland and plenish the whole bounds sufficiently with inhabitants."² The desirability of drawing off surplus population is frequently used as an argument for the plantation both of Ireland and of Virginia, and large numbers of emigrants are freely counted on. The Spanish ambassador Zuñiga learns in March, 1606, that the new company is planning to send 500 or 600 men to Virginia at once, and a few months later hears that the company will send 2,000 men; soon afterward 3,000 are talked of, then 1,500 more, with a plan of an early increase of the numbers to 12,000.³ In the colonization of Munster in 1586, similarly, 4,200 persons were planned for during the first year, 21,800 during the first seven years.⁴

Yet there is much to throw doubt on the correctness of this common impression of the existence of a large surplus of population in England. Overpopulation is entirely a relative term and can mean nothing more than either an excessive number of persons out of employment or a disproportionately rapid increase of population. It is very doubtful whether the latter of these conditions, at least, existed. Nothing is more untrustworthy than contemporary estimates of population. Dependent on the subjective attitude of the

¹ Reprinted in Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, I, 297.

² Hill, *Summary Sketch of the Great Ulster Plantation*.

³ Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, I, 46, 100, 102, 147.

⁴ *Cal. St. Papers, Ireland, 1586-1588*, p. 243.

person giving the estimate and his dwelling-place and opportunities for making a judgment, such a large movement as the increase or decrease of national population is quite beyond the capacities of an ordinary observer. No general statistics exist, so we are driven to indirect means of judgment. It is evident that great difficulty was found in obtaining settlers for the new colonies in both Ireland and Virginia. The plantation in Munster just referred to, instead of the anticipated 4,200 in the first year, had reached in five years only the number of 536. In 1592, at the end of seven years, instead of the 1,500 families required as a minimum by the conditions of settlement, there were but 245.¹ Of all the southern and central plantations of Ireland we hear the same story; the speculators who took the large tracts were forbidden to dispose of them to native Irish owners or tenants, but they were not successful, or at least were only partially and tardily successful in finding English or Scotch settlers, and thus largely failed to conform to the conditions of their grants. In Ulster, except in the shires nearest Scotland, the same was largely true. Every effort was made by the officials in formulating the terms of the contracts with the "undertakers" to secure British settlers and to exclude the Irish, but reports of 1619, 1622, 1624, and 1632 show great numbers of Irish tenants and a correspondingly small number of English and Scotch immigrants—not one-third of the number called for by the requirements.² The king was deeply disappointed, and from December, 1612, wrote a series of letters to the authorities in Ireland complaining bitterly of the failure to introduce any large body of English settlers in Derry and the other Ulster counties. Finally in 1635 the Irish Company of London was prosecuted in Star Chamber for having failed to fulfil the terms of its charter, and was proved not to have sent over as many settlers as required, and to have allowed the natives to outnumber the new-comers in many districts. It was thereupon condemned to pay a fine of £70,000 and to lose its lands.³ It was only into those counties which lay nearest to Scotland and which were in a specially favorable position in other respects that population flowed from the larger island in anything like an abundant stream; into all others it was a slender and slow-flowing current, till it practically ceased about 1630.

The settlers sent to Virginia were for a long time but few. A careful computation gives the following figures of those who left England for Virginia: 1606-1609, 300; 1609-1618, 1,500; 1618-

¹ Bonn, *Kolonisation*, I. 303-304.

² *Ibid.*, 334-342.

³ Gardiner, *History of England*, VIII. 59, 60.

1621, 3,570; so that in the fifteen years in which Virginia was the only American colony there were altogether but few more than 5,000 emigrants from England thither. The devices that were proposed to secure colonists, some of which indeed were adopted, suggest the same paucity in the supply. In 1611 Sir Thomas Dale, writing home to Lord Salisbury and appealing for a supply of 2,000 men, says that he has "conceived that if it will please his Majestie to banish hither all offenders condemned betwixt this and then to die, out of common Gaoles, and likewise so continue that grant for 3 yeres unto the Colonie, (and thus doth the Spaniard people his Indies,) it would be a readie way to furnish us with men."¹ The company, as a matter of fact, followed this policy to a limited extent through the whole period of its existence, but at this time convict emigration played but a small part compared with the extent to which it was later carried.² Yet the company repeatedly asked the mayor of London for vagrant boys and girls of the city to be sent to the colony, and in 1621 had a bill introduced into Parliament which would have required each parish in England to send at its own expense a certain number of its paupers to Virginia.³

The most destructive forces that were keeping down population in England at this time were three: warfare, death penalties inflicted by the law, and pestilence. It is true that England was in 1607 at peace, and destined to remain so for the next seventeen years, but peace was recent and had been preceded by a long warlike period. The generation that could be counted on for purposes of emigration was that which had been growing up in the past, and this could not be replaced immediately. It is true also, as frequent experience has shown, that national warfare does not necessarily deplete population. But the warfare of Elizabeth's time was particularly destructive to life. The small body of English troops which according to the treaty of 1585 England bound herself to keep up in the Netherlands was like a leak in one of the Dutch dikes. Badly selected, badly equipped, badly fed, the soldiers died in Holland and Zeeland almost faster than they could be recruited in England.⁴ Those who were in France in 1591 and the succeeding years were the victims of an only slightly less fatality; those in Ireland perhaps of a greater. The naval expeditions were even more fatal than land campaigns. The sailors and soldiers on board the vessels returning from the

¹ Brown, *Genesis of the United States*, I. 506.

² J. D. Butler in *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, II. 12-33.

³ *Records of the Virginia Company* (1906), I. 270, 431, 479, 489, 583, etc.

⁴ *Leycester Correspondence*, Camden Society, 167, 285, 338, 374, 384, 389, etc.; Motley, *United Netherlands*, I, chap. vi.

Armada fight "sickened one day and died the next" of ship-fever, until "many of the ships had hardly men enough to weigh their anchors." On the Portugal expedition of 1589 about 20,000 men embarked, less than 9,000 returned. Of 1,100 gentlemen volunteers on the expedition 700 died.¹ The subsequent expeditions of 1595, 1596, 1597, 1599, and 1601 were only somewhat less destructive to life. In 1598 Elizabeth ceased to pay the English troops in the service of the Netherlands, but they still remained there in the service of the States and were constantly recruited in England. Indeed the peace between England and Spain signed in 1604 made no change in their position except that the king made a barren and ineffective promise that he would try to persuade the Englishmen in the Netherlands service to return and would discourage others from going there.² English troops were kept in the cautionary towns in Holland and Zealand by the government till 1616, and English recruits were as a matter of fact obtained by the Dutch government. To these must be added those obtained for the archduke's service, in accordance with the permission given by the treaty. In 1610, the third year of the colonization of Virginia, there were 4,000 English troops in the Netherlands to be sent to the war in Cleves.³ Thus notwithstanding the generally peaceful policy of James, there was still a steady drain of English population for military purposes going on, as well as the necessity for recuperation from the larger losses of Elizabeth's time.

The losses by legal execution (although impossible, from the records now accessible, of statistical statement) can be roughly estimated, or at least can be discovered to have been considerable. In the years from 1608 to 1618, which cover the first decade of the settlement of Virginia, the court of jail-delivery of the county of Middlesex, which does not include the city and liberties of London, sent to execution 704 persons, an average of seventy a year. The number for that county for the whole of James's reign, so far as recorded, was 1,003, an average of about forty-five a year.⁴ In the county of Devon in the year 1598, a chance year, at the Lent assizes seventeen persons were hanged, at the autumn assizes eighteen, at the four quarter-sessions thirty-nine, making altogether seventy-four persons executed in the year. In the year 1596, forty persons were executed in the county of Somerset.⁵ To these are to be added 229

¹ State Papers, Dom., Eliz., cxxiii, No. 75; *Cal. St. Papers, Dom., 1581-1590*, p. 534; Lodge, *Illustrations of British History*, II. 355, etc.

² Winwood, *Memorials*, II. 27.

³ Gardiner, *History of England*, II. 100, 183; I. 219; Motley, *United Netherlands*, IV. 228.

⁴ Jeaffreson, *Middlesex County Records*, II. xvii-xx.

⁵ Hamilton, *Devonshire Quarter-Sessions*, 30-31.

Catholic recusants executed or allowed to die in prison under Elizabeth, and twenty-four under James;¹ and executions connected with special occurrences such as the rebellion of Essex and the Gunpowder Plot. When it is realized that, in each of the fifty-two shires of England and Wales, four times a year the justices of the peace and twice the justices of assize; and in each of the numerous chartered towns the corresponding judicial authorities were all busily applying a severe criminal code, it will be recognized that a check to overpopulation was being applied closely analogous to war and pestilence.

Yet there can be no doubt that the plague was the most destructive of all causes of the depletion of population at that time. At intervals approximating ten years this enemy, ill-understood, unprepared for, weakly opposed, invaded England and raised the death-rate for one or more years to many times its usual height. In 1593, in 1603, in the period from 1606 to 1610, and in 1625, London suffered losses that can be measured with considerable exactness; and during these and other years we have many glimpses of the ravages of the plague in other cities and in the rural parts of England. In the year 1593 there were 17,844 deaths in London and its immediate suburbs, of which 10,662 were attributed to the plague. Deaths from all other causes together were therefore but 7,182, and this was a larger number than usual. According to Stow, "There died in London and the liberties thereof, from the 23rd day of December 1602 to the 22nd day of December 1603, of all diseases 38,244, whereof of the plague 30,578."² The usual death-rate, according to these figures, was more than quadrupled; and there is other testimony to indicate that this is rather within than beyond the facts, another estimate, including some outlying districts, giving 42,945 deaths, whereof of the plague about 33,347.³ During the years from 1606 to 1610, the initial years of the settlement of Virginia, the plague was constantly active, though not nearly so destructive as in 1593 and 1603. The deaths specifically from the plague were as follows: 1606, 2,124; 1607, 2,352; 1608, 2,262; 1609, 4,240; and 1610, 1,803.⁴

The last serious visitation of the plague in London in this period was in 1625, in which year there were 54,265 deaths, of which 35,417 were attributed to the plague.⁵ In the middle of the summer the deaths from plague numbered more than 4,000 a week. In certain parishes where a maze of narrow streets, lanes, and alleys,

¹ Dodd-Tierney, *History of the Church of England*, III. 159-170; IV. 179-180.

² *Annales*, p. 857.

³ Creighton, *Epidemics in Britain*, I. 478.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 494.

⁵ *London's Remembrancer*.

lived with tenements, was filled with a crowded mass of the poorest of humanity, the deaths ran up to astonishing numbers; as in the case of St. Giles, Cripplegate, from which there were buried 3,988 persons during the year, 2,338 of them having died of the plague. The population of London and its suburbs in 1607 was probably about 225,000, the mortality in ordinary years being between 7,000 and 9,000, a proportion of about one-thirtieth, which was raised in more than one plague year to one-fifth or one-sixth.¹

The ravages of the plague in London were probably greater in degree than they were elsewhere, but not different in kind. Sometimes in entirely separate years, sometimes just preceding or succeeding the great London epidemics, we hear of the same desolating attacks on cities, towns, and villages scattered through all England. To estimate the effect of disease on population we must also add to the plague, technically so-called, other prevalent and fatal diseases, spotted fever, smallpox, flux, influenza, measles, and jail-fever or the "pining-sickness", all of which were exercising their full powers of destruction at this time.²

In view of all these conditions it is small wonder that early colonization could not command a very large body of emigrants from England. Indeed such material as it had to work with was provided rather by the displacement and disturbance of population in England than by its actual growth in numbers. This displacement was one of the most marked characteristics of the time. Economic and political causes had so far altered the equilibrium of large elements in the population that they were easily removable. Religious causes were to have the same effect in later times, indeed had already by the date of the settlement of Virginia begun their work. It was to this mobility of population that not only the possibility of colonization but the rapid growth of London was due. In an occasional favorable year the baptisms, which were practically the same in number as the births, exceeded the number of deaths, as in 1580 when the baptisms were 3,568, the deaths 2,873; but any slight access of the plague or other disease reversed the conditions, as in 1579 when there were 3,370 baptisms and 3,406 deaths; while a bad plague year made the deaths preponderate overwhelmingly over the births, as in 1578 when there were 3,150 christenings and 7,830 deaths, or in 1625 when in the city and suburbs 6,983 persons were christened, but 54,265 died.³ During a long period the deaths in London must have much exceeded the

¹ Creighton, *Epidemics in Britain*, I. 471-474.

² *Ibid.*, chaps. vi.-x.

³ *Ibid.*

births, yet the population of the city during the same period was increasing. Obviously this was from the constant flow of outsiders into it; foreign immigrants, English adventurers, restless or evicted, occupationless, and often criminal vagabonds. It was this disproportionate and abnormal growth of London and perhaps of some other large cities and towns, the "infinite increasing greatness of this city", that gave contemporaries the impression that England was teeming and suffering with a superabundance of population.

Bacon in 1606 saw the conditions more fairly and expressed them in a speech in Parliament on the proposed union between England and Scotland:

I must have leave to doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this realm of England is not yet peopled to the full. For certain it is, that the territories of France, Italy, Flanders, and some parts of Germany, do in equal space of ground bear and contain a far greater quantity of people, if they were mustered by the poll. Neither can I see that this kingdom is so much inferior unto those foreign parts in fruitfulness, as it is in population; which makes me conceive we have not our full charge. Besides, I do see manifestly amongst us the badges and tokens rather of scarceness, than of press of people; as drowned grounds, commons, wastes, and the like; which is a plain demonstration, that howsoever there may be an overswelling throng and press of people here about London, which is most in our eye, yet the body of the kingdom is but thin sown with people.¹

The more closely conditions in England in the years just preceding and contemporary with the foundation of Virginia are studied, the more natural does it seem that such a settlement should have been made, that it should have taken some such form as it did and suffered the difficulties it actually experienced. The whole movement was a natural, almost an inevitable one. But this naturalness does not diminish its significance. The grant of the charters to the Virginia Company, the settlement at Jamestown, the propaganda carried on in England in its interest, the activity of the company, the public discussion of the project, the attitude of the king toward it, make the whole movement one of the most important of its time. The subject of colonization was now for the first time, and for all subsequent time, made one of popular interest. In the years between 1606 and 1620 many pamphlets were issued and numerous sermons preached on the subject; appeals for support and statements of plans were made to the general government, to town authorities, to the London companies, to churches, and to individuals; the members of the company were numbered by hundreds, the number of investors large and small rose to thousands; general collections were taken up and lotteries were carried on for its ex-

¹ Spedding, *Letters and Life of Francis Bacon*, III. 312.

penses; it was the subject of discussion in the Privy Council, in Parliament, in the court of aldermen of London, and in the councils of various trading bodies. There must have been few persons in England who took any interest whatever in public questions who failed to become somewhat familiar with the subject of colonization; and all later similar movements were carried on in the light of this familiarity.

The influence of the Virginia project on the political movement of the day was by no means insignificant. It worked itself into the rising conflict between King and Parliament, giving occasion for defining the differences of political views between the royal and the popular party; and the Virginia Company, while falling a victim to the hostility of the former, strengthened and gave unity to the latter.

Lastly, it influenced the literature of the time; not only the literature of voyages and travels, of practical proposals and patriotic or religious appeals, but the higher forms of imaginative writing. Bacon's essay "On Plantations" under its classic terms and general observations scarcely conceals his specific views and criticisms of the Virginia project as it was being carried on. In Drayton's "Ode to the Virginian Voyage" the familiar expressions of the devotees of colonization are put into the service of no mean poetry:

And the ambitious vine
Crownes with his purple masse
The cedar reaching hie
To kisse the skie,
The cypresse, pine,
And usefull sassafras.

Thy voyages attend,
Industrious Hackluit,
Whose reading shall inflame
Men to seeke fame,
And much commend
To after-times thy wit.

Three excellent poets joined to immortalize the Virginian captain and the reckless adventurer in *Eastward Hoe*; and the changes are rung on "the Virginian continent", "Virginian priests", "Virginian princes", and "the noblest Virginians" in Chapman's mask played before the king by the gentlemen of the Inns of Court in 1613. The sights and sounds of the sea, the shipwreck, the boasting and roystering, the grace, the charm, and the high imagination of the *Tempest*, and much more that belongs to the literature of that time and of all time, are not without a close connection with the earliest voyages to Jamestown.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

SOVEREIGNTY IN THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION: AN HISTORICAL STUDY

It is the purpose of this paper to learn, if possible, from contemporary material just what ideas were in men's minds during the American Revolution when they thought of Congress, of the Union, of the states and their governments, of the Confederation, and of independence, and, further, to learn their true reasons for obeying Congress or their state governments. Then with some definite conclusions based upon facts and not general impressions, I wish to examine again the much-mooted question as to whether there was an American national state in the Revolution, and whether Congress or the state governments exercised the sovereign power. As we all know, this question derives its importance from the long and bitter historical controversy over state sovereignty, nullification, and secession. Personally, I believe that the solution, either in favor of state sovereignty or of Congressional sovereignty during the Revolution, has little or no bearing in establishing the legal right of nullification or secession,¹ but so many able writers² have laid such stress on proving the Continental Congress sovereign that the truth is worth a search.

Since the earliest time claimed for the existence of an American national state is the time of the assembling of the First Continental Congress, I begin with a consideration of that. Story speaks³ of this Congress as coming from "the people, acting directly in their primary, sovereign capacity, and without the intervention of the functionaries, to whom the ordinary powers of government were delegated". The facts are that delegates from two colonies⁴ were chosen by the legislatures,⁵ elected by the people in the ordinary

¹ That question can be settled by studying what the Constitutional Convention thought it had done and actually did, and to what the people of the states or the people of the nation (as one pleases) bound themselves when they accepted a Constitution which provided that the Constitution and laws made in accordance therewith should be the law of the land, enforceable in the courts, and that the government thereby established might operate directly upon every individual. By accepting this they left themselves nothing but the right of revolution.

² Some of these are Lieber, Story, Pomeroy, Hare, Bancroft, Lincoln, Von Holst, Fiske, Burgess.

³ Joseph Story, *Commentaries*, fourth edition, I. 140.

⁴ Rhode Island and Pennsylvania.

⁵ Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 416, 607.

way for ordinary purposes of law-making. The delegates from Massachusetts, a third colony, were chosen by the lower house duly elected, with no special instructions to choose delegates to the Continental Congress.¹ Georgia was not represented at all, and in only six colonies were there special conventions or provincial congresses of the nature Story imagines them all to have been.

He adds to this false premise the assertion, "The Congress thus assembled exercised *de facto* and *de jure* a sovereign authority; not as the delegated agents of the governments *de facto* of the colonies, but in virtue of original powers derived from the people."² Such a statement could come only from one who had not read the instructions of the delegates, or the journal of this Congress's proceedings. Four delegations were instructed to procure the harmony and union of the empire,³ to restore mutual confidence, or to establish the union with Great Britain. Three were instructed to repair the breach made in American rights, to preserve American liberty, or to accomplish some similar end. Two were to get a repeal of the obnoxious acts, or determine on prudent or lawful measures of redress. Three were simply to attend Congress or "to consult to advance the good of the colonies".⁴ North Carolina alone bound her inhabitants in honor to obey the acts of the Congress to which she was sending delegates.⁵ When the Congress met, it restricted its proceedings absolutely to statements of the grievances and appeals for relief. The delegates in no way went beyond their instructions, as a careful examination of their journal will show.⁶ Conservative feelings ruled, and the restoration of union and harmony with Great Britain was the prevalent desire. It is manifestly wrong, therefore, to look at the First Continental Congress as coming together because of a national feeling, because of a desire to form a national state, and therefore to ascribe to it governmental powers. It was called because a joint appeal for relief would naturally be more effective than any single petition. The colonies sending delegates to the First Continental Congress no more coalesced into a national state by that

¹ Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 421.

² Story, *Commentaries*, fourth ed., I. 140. Burgess too, *Political Science and Constitutional Law*, I. 100, says that this Congress "was the first organization of the American state." From the first moment of its existence "there was a sovereignty, a state, not in idea simply, or upon paper, but in fact and in organization."

³ See *Journals of Congress*, I. 15-24. My references to the *Journals*, throughout the article, are to the edition by Mr. W. C. Ford.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 15-30.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁶ This is Mr. Ford's opinion (*ibid.*, 6) with which any candid reader of the journal must agree.

act than did the colonies which sent delegates to the Albany Congress or the Stamp Act Congress.

But let us give those who argue along this line the benefit of a doubt, and assume that it was the Second Continental Congress which in their opinion exercised *de facto* and *de jure* a sovereign authority.

Before coming to any conclusion as to the right or wrong of this view we must examine in a historical spirit the question what powers the constituents of the delegations meant to give them, what the Continental Congress thought of its own powers at any time during its existence, what the people of the colonies thought, and to what extent they recognized by their actions the sovereign authority attributed to Congress by Story and others.

Three of the delegations to the Second Congress were chosen by the regular legislatures,¹ three by the lower houses of the legislatures,² and seven by provincial congresses or conventions of town or county delegates.³ Of these delegations three were merely to represent, or attend, meet, and report,⁴ two to join, consult, and advise,⁵ six to concert and agree or determine upon,⁶ while Georgia's delegates were "To do, transact, join and concur with the several Delegates".⁷ Maryland and North Carolina, from the first, and Georgia and New Jersey⁸ later, bound the state and people to abide by the resolutions of Congress,⁹ though doubtless all felt more or less this obligation.

The delegates were to exercise these powers for the purpose of "restoring harmony" or "accommodating the unhappy differences" with Great Britain,¹⁰ to obtain a "redress of American grievances," a "re-establishment of American rights," or "a repeal of offensive acts".¹¹ Some delegations were "to preserve and defend our Rights

¹ Delaware, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania. See *ibid.*, II., Instructions to Delegates.

² South Carolina, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

³ Georgia was not represented at first, but later a provincial congress sent delegates.

⁴ New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

⁵ Connecticut and Rhode Island.

⁶ Massachusetts, South Carolina, New Hampshire, Maryland, Delaware (also "to report"), and New York. See also Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 379.

⁷ Not sent until September 13, 1775; see *Journals of Congress*.

⁸ February 14, 1776.

⁹ For all the above facts see *Journals of Congress*, II., Instructions to Delegates.

¹⁰ So in the cases of South Carolina, New York, Delaware, Massachusetts, and Georgia.

¹¹ Rhode Island, South Carolina, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII. — 35.

and liberties"¹ or "for advancing the best Good of the Colonies,"² and three were instructed to no definite purpose.³ Although eight of these colonies sent new instructions before January, 1776⁴ (and this date is important, as will be presently shown), yet only two changed the character of their instructions, Maryland leaving out the binding clause,⁵ and Connecticut making the object sought, defense, security, and the preservation of rights. It is absurd to say that all these legislatures and conventions were hypocritical, saying what they did not mean, and if we seek honestly to know the wishes of the majorities in each representative body we shall examine these instructions, remembering, moreover, that these bodies were for the most part representative not of all the people,⁶ but of the most radical, those who would be the first to think of independence and the formation of a new state.

Remembering these instructions and the length of time they remained unchanged, let us examine the next point made by Justice Story and others in his wake. He says:⁷ "The Congress of 1775 accordingly assumed at once the exercise of some of the highest functions of sovereignty. They took measures for national defence and resistance", raised an army and navy, established a post-office, raised money, emitted bills of credit, and "contracted debts upon national account," authorized captures and condemnation of prizes. Let us see what Congress thought and what men of that time thought of the nature of these acts, for this *idea* in men's minds is of importance.

If the instructions to Congress meant anything, the delegates came together unauthorized by the people to act as a national government. They were to keep the councils of the colonies united while the English government was being forced to yield what men thought their rights.⁸ In attempting to accomplish this end open war developed, and the Congress gradually did assume all these

¹ Georgia, North Carolina, and Rhode Island.

² Connecticut.

³ Virginia, North Carolina, and New Jersey.

⁴ Delaware, October 21, 1775; Maryland, December 9, 1775; New Hampshire, August 23, 1775; North Carolina, September 8, 1775; Massachusetts, November 10, 1775; Connecticut, October, 1775; Pennsylvania, November 3, 1775.

⁵ *Journals of Congress*, III. 441; IV. 58.

⁶ All of their acts were repudiated by the Loyalists, who were no insignificant part of the population.

⁷ Story, *Commentaries*, fourth ed., I. 151-152.

⁸ *Journals of Congress*, IV. 136, last paragraph.

⁹ It must be remembered, however, that it was the New England colonies that began the war, and that the other colonies assembled in Congress were most reluctantly dragged into the struggle.

powers which Story enumerates, but the striking thing is that it did all these things at a time when¹ the majority of Congress would vote repeatedly for addresses, to the king, the inhabitants of Great Britain, the people of Ireland and of Jamaica, which asserted, "We have not raised Armies with ambitious Designs of separating from Great Britain, and establishing independent States,"² and assured the king that they most ardently wished the former harmony with Great Britain, vowing their allegiance to him³ and that they would cheerfully bleed in defense of him in a righteous cause. As late as October in 1775, reconciliation is a common sentiment⁴ and the royal post-routes were still in operation.⁵ Even late as January 15, 1776, Samuel Adams could not head off a motion to explain to the people that reconciliation was the desire of Congress.⁶ In the middle of February, 1776, James Wilson argued with great sincerity that many of the steps thus far taken by Congress could be accounted for rationally only upon the supposition that their object was the defense and re-establishment of their rights, and could not be so accounted for if their aim was an independent empire.⁷ I do not believe the majority of Congress to have been hypocrites drawing long faces and pretending a loyalty they did not feel. As James Wilson said, "Those Protestations of Loyalty and Expressions of Attachment ought, by every Rule of Candour, to be presumed to be sincere, unless Proofs evincing their Insincerity

¹ *Navy*.—Congress recommends (July 18, 1775) the states to establish. *Journals*, II. 189. First Continental vessel, October 13, 1775. Fleet provided October 30, 1775. Zubly seconds motion for fleet October 7, 1775, but the previous day asserts that the man who would suggest independence would be torn to pieces like De Witt. *Journals*, III. 483.

Indian Commissioners appointed July 12, 1775.

Post-Office.—A committee to establish post-routes appointed May 29, 1775, and Postmaster-General decided upon July 26; but side by side with the Continental routes, the British postal system existed undisturbed as late as October 7, 1775; see *Journals of Congress* on those dates.

Treasury.—Congress borrows for Continental uses June 3, 1775, uses money first on June 10, and pledges the twelve colonies for redemption of bills of credit June 22, 1775.

Army.—First provision was June 14, 1775. General decided upon, June 15. Organization planned June 16, 1775. Suggestion comes from Massachusetts. *Journals*, II. 78.

² *Ibid.*, 155. July 6, 1775, *ibid.*, IV. 143. See also *Writings of Jefferson*, ed. Ford, I. 482; Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, III. 794, 795.

³ July 8, 1775, *Journals*, II. 160; July 28, 1775, *ibid.*, 139, 155, 198, 217; IV. 137, 142.

⁴ See *ibid.*, III. 481, 482, 489. *Life of Belknap*, 96-97.

⁵ *Journals*, III. 488.

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV. 57; also February 13, 1776, *ibid.*, 137.

⁷ See his convincing argument on this subject, *ibid.*, 142-143.

can be drawn from the Conduct of those who used them."¹ If they were honest it seems axiomatic that the members of the Continental Congress could not regard themselves, or be regarded by the men who read their papers, as the sovereign head of a united people, when they and the people wished to be loyal subjects of the British king, and acknowledged his sovereignty.

In the very "Declaration on Taking Arms,"² Congress showed the desire and expectation of reconciliation. Just as non-importation and non-exportation were not illegal in the colonial view, but a peaceful means of forcing the repeal of obnoxious laws,³ so armies and loyalty were not incompatible.⁴ There is no doubt, as Trevelyan suggests, that many American revolutionists were like the Puritan country gentlemen at the beginning of the struggle against Charles I., who held that to bear arms against the Crown was consistent with the duty of a loyal subject; and loyal subjects they were bound to remain.⁵ The attitude of men to the warlike measures is perhaps most strikingly shown in the seemingly paradoxical position of Zubly, Georgia's delegate (October 6, 7, 1775), who seconded a motion for preparing a plan for an American fleet, though on the previous day he had said that if any one proposed to break off from Great Britain, he would inform his constituents. "I apprehend", he added, "the man who should propose it would be torn to pieces like DeWitt."⁶ The idea of loyalty to the British king and a co-existent desire for an American national state are incompatible, therefore if Congress was doing seemingly sovereign acts, it was merely in the capacity of a party committee⁷ leading a rebellious faction in the empire in an attempt to force the concession of its rights. This liberal faction happened to have its greatest strength in America, and the committee therefore acted in the interests of American Whigs only.

But there came a time when the contemplation of a series of

¹ *Journals*, IV. 137.

² *Ibid.*, II. 139, 155. They assure all the subjects of the empire that they "mean not in any wise to affect that union with them". See also David Humphreys, *Miscellaneous Works*, 271.

³ *Journals*, II. 205; IV. 138.

⁴ See how the taking of Crown Point and Ticonderoga are explained. *Ibid.*, II. 167, 171. Such was the spirit as to opening ports and allowing privateers. *Ibid.*, 201; IV. 231.

⁵ Trevelyan, *The American Revolution*, part II., vol. I., p. 112.

⁶ *Journals of Congress*, III. 483, 486.

⁷ Its work of this kind is best seen in its measures against the Tories, *ibid.*, 280; IV. 25, 49. In this light Congress seems to be only a convention of delegates representing the Whig party in America, not all the American people. The Loyalists held this view throughout the war.

ministerial errors so embittered the colonists against the mother-country that Americans changed the banner under which they were fighting, and in place of liberty merely they were aiming at liberty and independence. They had used the word "union" and the expression "united colonies" a great deal during the earlier struggle, when they simply meant united efforts for the attainment of concessions² which no one colony singly could hope to wrest from the powerful British government. Now they continued the struggle for independence with the same general idea of united effort, no longer of colonies, but of states independent and sovereign in all governmental matters, but leagued to overthrow the power of England, and to command the respect of other world-powers. To attempt united action by a clumsy system of correspondence was impracticable, and the Continental Congress, in which were assembled representatives of the sovereign states, was a convenient centre of intelligence and a source of advice which would keep their forces united.³ As the Maryland convention expressed it, "the best and only proper exercise [of the powers of Congress] can be in adopting the wisest measures for equally securing the rights and liberties of each of the United States, which was the principle of their union."⁴ To Congress was yielded a temporary and indefinite authority for war purposes, but its permanent relation with the states was to be determined by future agreement.⁵

In thus unifying the councils and action of thirteen colonies at first and states later, Congress did many things that seem at first view the acts of a national government, but an analysis of some of these more deceptive actions will clear our understanding of their character. There are instances of dissensions between colonies being referred to Congress to settle, but, since nothing would weaken the colonies' military efficiency as would intercolonial quarrels, it

¹ The use of the word "colony" had significance too, and the retaining it showed how men clung to the idea of preserving the empire. As late as November, 1775, Adams could not get "colony" struck out of a report though the committee "were as high Americans as any in the house". *Works of John Adams*, III. 21, 22.

² Note the distinction in the "Declaration on Taking Arms." They assure all subjects "that we mean not to dissolve that Union [*i. e.*, the national union] . . . which we sincerely wish to see restored," but in the same document "Our Union [*i. e.*, for the purpose of getting concessions] is perfect." July 6, *Journals*, II. 154, 155. See also II. 87-88, 198, 217; III. 321, 477, 488; IV. 142, 146.

³ Note, for example, *ibid.*, II. 60, 74, 85, 183, 188, 189, 192, 212; III. 278, 279, 323, 363; IV. 21, etc.

⁴ Scharf, *Maryland*, II. 273-277.

⁵ Note that North Carolina and Pennsylvania provide in their constitutions for delegates as long as it shall be necessary. Poore, *Constitutions*, North Carolina, xxxvii.; Pennsylvania, sect. 11.

was as important for Congress to try to reconcile these differences as to direct the armies or provide a naval force. That this is not perverting the logic of such action may be plainly seen in the case (September 30, 1775) where Congress is asked to settle the dispute between Connecticut and Pennsylvania "until the matter shall be determined by the King and Council, to whom both sides have submitted the dispute."¹ Congress urged the people of the two colonies not to endanger the union, but it refused to take any measures that would seem an assumption of sovereignty.²

Again, the states called upon Congress, the assembling-place of all of the states, to assume responsibility which the state did not dare assume alone, but which was necessary for the common defense.³ Again the colonies asked Congress about establishing new governments,⁴ and much has been made of the fact that Congress recommended the establishment of such forms as seemed best; but the advice cannot be twisted into a sovereign command, for the thing is to be done "during the continuance of the present dispute between Great Britain and the colonies."⁵ A body regarding itself as sovereign does not speak thus. Later, when affairs were nearer a climax (May 10, 1776), Congress recommended the formation of permanent governments, but it is noticeable that in this case the states acted at their leisure,⁶ and Maryland resented the interference of Congress⁷ and refused to obey. Congress was again rebuffed when it ordered the committee of observation of Baltimore to seize Governor Eden's secretary. The committee acted without the authorization of the Maryland council of safety, and was severely reprimanded for obeying "other than those intrusted with the proper authority by this Province".⁸ Congress was constantly steering between the Scylla of sovereignty, and the Charybdis of inefficiency.

It was in Congress that independence was resolved upon, and

¹ *Journals of Congress*, III. 283, 287, 295, 453, 487. Congress evidently was not looked upon as having sovereign authority.

² *Ibid.*, IV. 283.

³ New Jersey asks, June 24, 1776, about seizing Governor Franklin, *ibid.*, V. 473. Sometimes the approval of Congress is asked for more selfish ends. *Ibid.*, II. 25; III. 274. As to seizing Dunmore, there was a significant dispute. *Ibid.*, 482.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II. 77; III. 298.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 319, 326.

⁶ Delaware and Pennsylvania acted in September, 1776; Maryland in November, 1776; North Carolina in December, 1776; Georgia in February, 1777; New York in April, 1777.

⁷ Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, V. 1588. Note also the attitude of Duane, *Journals of Congress*, VI. 1075; and of Wilson, *ibid.*, 1075-1076.

⁸ *Ibid.*, IV. 286; Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, V. 1564, 1566, 1590.

that, says Von Holst, in destroying the bonds between the colonies and England, "threw down the walls which had hitherto prevented the political union of the thirteen colonies. They were, in fact, thrown together so as to constitute them one people."¹ But was that viewed by contemporaries as an act consolidating the several colonies, and by whose sanction did they regard it as taking effect? It was declared during the debate upon the resolution² "that if the delegates of any particular colony had no power to declare such colony independent, certain they were the others could not declare it for them, the colonies being as yet perfectly independent of each other". Declare independence before these delegates were authorized to that end, and the middle state delegates "must retire" and "their colonies might secede from the union".

This assertion was not disputed³ and Congress waited until, with the exception of New York, all the delegations were instructed favorably or had large powers and were sure enough of subsequent sanction to vote for the resolution. The action of the twelve colonies did not bind New York until her own convention approved, and at least seven of the states⁴ showed by their subsequent resolutions giving to the Declaration the binding force of law within their states that they did not recognize the power of Congress to legislate for them even in a matter so vital to all as the separation from Great Britain.

If there were any doubt as to what the Declaration implied when it said "that these United Colonies are . . . Free and Independent States . . ." and "they have full Power to levy War", etc., that doubt would be dispelled by reading the resolves of the state conventions or assemblies in approving the Declaration. The Pennsylvania convention passed a resolve approving, in behalf of themselves and their constituents, of Congress's resolution, declaring "this, as well as the other United States of America, free and Independent," and declared "before God and the world that we will support and maintain the freedom and independence of this and the other United

¹ Von Holst, *Constitutional History of the United States*, I. 8.

² By Wilson, Livingston, Rutledge, or Dickinson. *Journals of Congress*, VI. 1088. See also Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, IV. 739.

³ Indeed it was clearly affirmed in the case of Maryland. *Ibid.*

⁴ New York, *ibid.*, fifth series, I. 1391; Rhode Island, *Colonial Records*, VII. 581; Connecticut, *State Records*, I. 3; Pennsylvania, Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 10; Maryland, *ibid.*, III. 88-89; also *ibid.*, fourth series, VI. 1507; New Jersey, *ibid.*, 1648; Virginia, Hazelton, *The Declaration of Independence*, 273.

States of America."¹ The Connecticut assembly approved of the Declaration, and resolved "that this Colony is and of right ought to be a free and independent State."² The "walls" were evidently not down in the opinion of these contemporary state legislators and they thought it their sanction which gave validity to the resolution of independence.³ This preservation of state identity, and belief in the state's freedom to do its will politically, appears frequently during the debate on the Articles of Confederation.⁴

While discussing the land question, Wilson of Pennsylvania said that his state had no right to interfere in those claims, "but she has a right to say, that she will not confederate unless those claims are cut off,"⁵ and Huntington of Virginia denied Congress the right to limit the bounds of his state and asserted that the consequence of such an attempt would be that Virginia would not enter the Confederation.⁶ Witherspoon, August 1, 1776, conceived of the colonies as individuals come together to make a bargain with each other.⁷ That this bargain was thought of as a treaty between sovereign states, there is good contemporary evidence aside from the articles themselves. "I daily expect the Treaty of Confederation", wrote Governor Cooke of Rhode Island.⁸ Indeed the Confederation seemed to some merely a league which the states formed for the war.⁹ If it were not formed then, Sherman feared it never would be formed¹⁰; some did not see the necessity of it¹¹ even for that pur-

¹ Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 10. See also *Journals of Congress*, V. 690, where the "thirteen independent states of America" are to have initials on the seal.

² *Records of the State of Connecticut*, I. 3.

³ Significant also is Madison's assertion in 1782, that the Crown rights had not devolved upon Congress, an idea "so extravagant that it could not enter into the thought of man." *New York Historical Society Collections*, 1878, p. 147.

⁴ *Journals of Congress*, VI. 1081. These debates were after the Declaration of Independence, it must be remembered. Hopkins of Rhode Island asserts, "The safety of the whole depends upon the distinctions of Colonies."

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1077.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1083. Franklin thought that if all the colonies would not enter, it had better be formed by those inclined to it. John Adams, *Works*, IX. 373.

⁷ *Journals*, VI. 1103 (but see Adams's answer, 1104). Sherman thought as did Witherspoon. *Ibid.*, 1081.

⁸ Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, I. 377. See also Randolph's idea, Madison's *Writings*, ed. Hunt, III. 37.

⁹ *Journals of Congress*, VI. 1079. Note the same idea in Jefferson to Marbois, *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, October, 1906, p. 77. The first draft of the Articles of Confederation contained a clause, "The said Colonies unite themselves so as never to be divided by any Act whatever," but this was early struck out of the draft and does not appear later. Evidently none wished to bind the league of friendship so firmly as this.

¹⁰ August 25, 1777. *Life of Sherman*, 106.

¹¹ Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, I. 672.

pose. The agreement of the states to any kind of confederation seemed at times almost desperate, and after all a league of sovereign states was all men would concede.¹

The articles as finally adopted furnish us with an admirable measure of the depths or rather shallows of national feeling and of the intensity or rather weakness of the contemporary desire for a state. We cannot discuss the character of the Confederation here, but it is a common judgment among political scientists and historians that there was less national unity after its adoption than before it.² As Professor Burgess expresses it, "the American [national] state ceased to exist in objective organization." The subjective existence, the "idea in the consciousness of the people"³ which he declares to have remained, is just what I believe that the facts here submitted show not to have existed. Though the whole logic of the situation seems to us now, and seemed to a few leaders then, to point to the necessity of the formation of a national state, yet the vast majority of men refused to see it,⁴ and hugged the delusive phantom of independent and of sovereign statehood for each of the thirteen colonies. Individual interests might be sunk temporarily in order to accomplish by military union a great individual desire, but the affections and the impulses of obedience centred in the state governments.

However dependent the states might be upon each other for military strength to meet the assaults of England, facts, too numerous to be gainsaid, can be cited to show the opinion of state legislatures, state conventions, and individuals in the states as to the actual political independence and sovereignty of the state. To mere assertions in state constitutions that the state is independent and sovereign⁵ we need give little attention, but powers granted in constitutional conventions and acts of sovereignty done by state governments have greater importance. South Carolina specifically endowed its

¹ In this connection it is important to note the contemporary conception of a confederation. Franklin's plan of confederation provided for a league even though the colonies remained part of the British Empire. Bringing about reconciliation was one of the functions of his confederation, and of course the organ of united action, the Congress, could not have sovereign powers if it existed within the British Empire. *Journals of Congress*, II. 195, 198; III. 301; IV. 149. The Rhode Island assembly instructed its delegates to promote a confederation at a time when it would not instruct for independence. *Ibid.*, 353.

² Pomeroy, Von Holst, Burgess, Lieber, *et al.*

³ Burgess, *Political Science and Constitutional Law*, I. 101.

⁴ Fisher Ames, *Works*, I. 113. "Instead of feeling as a nation, a state is our country." See also Austin's *Gerry*, I. 407-415, quoted by Von Holst, I. 29, and Rives, *Madison*, II. 177.

⁵ Poore, *Constitutions*: Connecticut, I. 257; New Hampshire, II. 1281, art. vii.; Massachusetts, I. 958, art. iv.

government with the power to make war, conclude a peace, enter into treaties, lay embargoes, and provide an army and navy.¹ Other states specified some of these powers and implied the rest.²

That these powers were implied is proven by the exercise of them by the government established. Virginia ratified the treaty with France³, and her diplomatic activity was so great that she established by law a clerkship of foreign correspondence⁴. William Lee was sent to France by Governor Henry and was given power under the state seal to obtain arms or borrow money of "his most Christian Majesty."⁵ Franklin speaks of "three several states" negotiating with France for loans and naval and war supplies.⁶ He complains that they "seem to think it my duty . . . to support and enforce their particular demands."⁷ In fact the states seem to have regarded the minister sent by Congress to be their particular minister as well as that of other states. Embargoes were laid⁸ and ports thrown open to the world by the enactments of state legislatures,⁹ sometimes at the suggestion of Congress, but often not. Patrick Henry, who had talked of all America being "thrown into one mass" and who was not a Virginian but an American—when he was seeking to increase the power of Virginia in the First Continental Congress, by securing proportional representation—this same eloquent Henry actively negotiated with Spain in 1778 for a loan and for the approval of Spain to the erection of a fort on Virginia's border, promising in return "the gratitude of this free and independent country, the trade in any or all of its valuable productions, and the friendship of its warlike inhabitants."¹⁰ The whole correspondence is in the tone of one not doubting the independence and sovereignty of his state.

Besides these assumptions of sovereignty in dealing with other

¹ Poore, *Constitutions*, II. 1625-1626.

² See *ibid.*, Pennsylvania, II. 1545, sect. 20; North Carolina, II. 1412, XIX.; Maryland, I. 825, XXXIII.; Delaware, I. 274, 275; Massachusetts, I. 965.

³ See Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation de la France*, IV. 155.

⁴ Hening, *Statutes*, IX. 467. To be filled by a person learned in the modern languages.

⁵ *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, I. 328-329. Mazzei also was sent to Italy with a like commission. Hunt, *Madison*, 30.

⁶ Wharton, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, III. 192, 153. Maryland and Virginia are especially mentioned.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 192. Later the English government was curious to know whether Congress or the states individually had the right to negotiate. *Diplomatic Correspondence*, 1783-1789, I. 574.

⁸ *State Records of Connecticut*, I. 12, 63, 71. Hening, *Statutes*, IX. 530.

⁹ Virginia, February 16, 1776. *Journals of Congress*, VI. 1072.

¹⁰ Clark MSS., vol. 58, p. 103, library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

nations, the states gave other proofs that they allowed Congress to exercise no function which they did not themselves have greater right to exercise. True, Congress organized a Continental navy, but nine of the thirteen states also fitted out navies of their own¹ and they were able to tax their citizens for supporting the establishment, while Congress could only beg the states to support its navy. Nor were the state fleets very helpful to the Continental fleet, for as Mr. Paullin says², "The commander of a state vessel or the master of a privateer, for aught either could see, subtended as large an angle in maritime affairs, as an officer of Congress, which body was to them nebulous, uncertain, and irresolute." As to privateering some of the states established state privateering, while some adopted the Continental system or adapted state laws to it.³

In the organizing of armies the story is the same. Congress could only urge the patriotic to volunteer and then bemoan its unfilled ranks. It must turn to the states for a support which was never more than half-heartedly given and see with chagrin the state armies filled by drafts and by tempting bounties outbidding what Congress could offer and in defiance of the urgent appeals of Congress to stop this ruinous rivalry.⁴ The sufferings of the Continental troops at Valley Forge were not due to the poverty of America, but to the fact that the states would not exert themselves in taxing for the army's support.⁵ Not only were armies organized by states, but they were used for state ends, and Virginia in the case of the expedition of George Rogers Clark actually carried on war without the knowledge of Congress, at her own expense, and for her own aggrandizement.⁶ Much of the early war in the South was carried on without the aid or advice of Congress.

If Indian affairs were regulated by Congress, so were they by the states. Congress established post-routes, but so did little Rhode Island;⁷ and finally we must remember that whatever acts of sovereign nature Congress recommended, it was the states that enforced these acts—laying an embargo, sanctioning the seizure of provisions for the army, collecting and pledging the only revenues, raising the

¹ Paullin, *The Navy of the American Revolution*, 152. Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Massachusetts.

² *Ibid.*, 153.

³ *Ibid.*, 321.

⁴ *Journals of Congress*, VI. 944-946. Hening, *Statutes*, X. 17, 18.

⁵ Yet Congress was constantly urging, in vain and without power to compel this most necessary obedience. *Journals*, III. 458; IV. 339; and many other instances in the journals. See index, under Bounties, etc.

⁶ Hening, *Statutes*, IX. 552.

⁷ *Colonial Records of Rhode Island*, VII. 352.

only taxes, keeping social order, protecting property, and administering justice.

No one was more conscious of this jealous retention of state sovereignty than the members of Congress themselves.¹ In matters where the interests of an individual state were seriously involved the opposition of the delegates of that single state was enough to cause Congress to refrain from passing a recommendation.² If Congress desired in the interest of all to pry closely into the affairs of a state, an apology was sure to accompany the resolution.³ On committees to consider any important measures Congress thought it necessary to have one member from each colony.⁴ Even in the case of recalcitrant members of its own body, Congress was never forgetful that the member was there in the capacity of a diplomat from a sovereign state.⁵ Limitations upon a delegate's instructions were also duly regarded⁶ and no delegate dared make any important proposition in Congress without first being requested to do so by his state, in the form of a proposition by one sovereign state to the other sovereign states assembled by their delegates in Congress.⁷

These are only a few of the many facts which go to show the truth of Randolph's assertion as to Congress: "They have therefore no will of their own, they are a mere diplomatic body, and are always obsequious to the views of the states".⁸ John Adams, too, described them as "not a legislative assembly, nor a representative assembly; but only a diplomatic assembly."⁹ Only in that view was it reasonable for each state to have but one vote in Congress.¹⁰ Because of the same idea in men's minds, the delegates from all the states except New Hampshire and Georgia were elected by the state legislatures,

¹ Notice their attitude in regard to raising Continental troops. *Journals of Congress*, V. 470, 521.

² *Ibid.*, IV. 279; II. 125; V. 481. Sometimes the resolution was passed in the form of a harmless hint which the state could carry out or not. *Ibid.*, 463; South Carolina delegates to Rutledge.

³ *Ibid.*, IV. 167. Sometimes it resisted appeals to interfere. *Ibid.*, 185.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III. 262, 488; IV. 76.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III. 357; and *Secret Journals*, April 10 and 11, 1778.

⁶ *Journals*, VI. 1074.

⁷ See suggestion of army, navy, independence, etc.

⁸ Madison, *Writings*, ed. Hunt, III. 181. Mason had a like view. "Under the existing Confederacy, Congress represents the *states*", etc. *Ibid.*, 101. It was this fact and the rise and fall of enthusiasm for the union which handicapped the work of Congress, and explains much of its so-called sloth and incompetence.

⁹ *A Defence of the Constitutions of the United States* (1787).

¹⁰ Madison thought this reasonable only while "the Union was a federal one among sovereign states." Madison, *Writings*, ed. Hunt, III. 44. The idea was that "a little Colony has its all at stake as well as a great one." J. Adams, *Works*, II. 366.

as provided in the new state constitutions. Men thought of the Continental Congress as Europeans later thought of the Congress at Laybach (in 1821) to which the members of the Holy Alliance sent representatives who assumed in no wise any sovereign power over the participating nations. Like it, Congress was an advisory body having no recognized sovereign power but a considerable coercive force exercised through the other states and due to the generally recognized fact that success for each depended upon the unity of all.¹

Yet with all the pressure of a common peril to induce obedience to Congress, there are numerous examples of disobedience by states and state officials, when state interests conflicted with the general interest, and in such cases Congress was helpless.² "So long as the expenses were to be paid by the Continent, the Congress could direct the details and the results, but when the cost was to be paid by the state, recommendations from the Congress carried weight only so far as they fell in with the expediency of the local authorities."³ The very formation of state governments with constitutions prepared the way for a decline in the influence of the Congress.⁴ The strong men preferred to serve in state governments rather than to serve in Congress,⁵ and on the other hand, as Hamilton pointed out, "Each State in order to promote its own internal government and prosperity, has selected its best members to fill the offices within itself, and conduct its own affairs."⁶ It is noteworthy that a recommendation of Congress must first be approved by the state authorities be-

¹ The inhabitants of Savannah express the prevalent idea. Force, *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 1544. Not to wish success of the general cause was "Toryism", a stigma which neither individuals nor states cared to have fixed upon them. See Rush's view, *Pennsylvania Magazine*, XXVII. 135.

² Connecticut and Pennsylvania. *Journals of Congress*, IV. 93; III. 321; V. 469. Note especially the famous Olmstead Case, when Pennsylvania set at naught a decision of the Commissioners of Congress. Congress, "not wishing to endanger the public peace of the United States", proceeded no further. Jameson, *Essays*, 17-22. When a state did obey a request of the Congress which bore hard upon them, Congress commended them for "additional proofs of their meritorious attachment to the common cause." *Journals of Congress*, IV. 99. In a careful study of Maryland's relations with Congress by Mr. F. B. Keeney in my seminary it was shown that out of eighty resolutions of Congress asking Maryland to do certain things forty-five were not heeded by the Maryland convention, and in every controversy between the state and Congress the latter was obliged to yield.

³ Mr. Ford's preface to the *Journals of Congress* for 1776, p. 8.

⁴ *Journals*, IV. 8. One should note too the greater hurry and success in making the state constitutions, and how much more ready men were to yield large powers to them than to grant such to Congress in the Articles of Confederation.

⁵ Washington's *Writings*, ed. Sparks, V. Appendix, 508-509.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 509.

fore a state administrative officer would obey.¹ Finally, it is significant that confidence in state issues of money exceeded that in the Continental bills, indicating a firmer belief in the perpetuity of the states than in the Congress.

Up to this point we have been studying historically the ideas which men had during the American Revolution as to the nature of Congress, the state governments, and the powers of each. If the ideas and wishes of men were what the submitted facts and arguments seem to show, there could have been no common will demanding the creation of a national state. But this is the assertion made by the exponents of the sovereign Congress. A consciousness of nationality no doubt there was, because geographical position, laws, manners, history, and prevailing language² all combined to that end, but it is a mistake to confuse the idea of nationality with that of the state. National consciousness may exist, as it did in the minds of the people of Germany and Italy, before a national state was created. The people dwelling in the loosely confederated states of Germany before 1866 were people of the same race;³ their economic interests were quite as unified as were those of America in 1776, and their several governments were alike in character, but Germany had no central government endowed with sovereign powers, and there was no common will demanding the creation of a national state. This I conceive to have been the condition in America until the trying experiences of the period of the Confederation⁴ taught a majority of Americans, what a few had long seen, that the whole logic of the situation demanded the creation of a national state. Even then it was only with a grudging hand that the essentials of sovereignty were granted to the government created by the Federal Constitution, and in so dubious a manner, that men have disputed ever since as to whether a national state actually did then come into existence.

After all has been said for the view here maintained, there still remain some vexing facts, and some utterances of contemporaries hard to reconcile.⁵ Most of these will be explained, however, if we

¹ *Provincial Papers of New Hampshire*, VII. 512. *Journals of Congress*, IV. 285-286.

² Giddings, *Descriptive and Historical Sociology*, 205.

³ Their race elements were more unified than those of America.

⁴ Added of course to the lessons in unity learned in the Revolutionary army, and the fact that America's isolation from the rest of the world must have given citizens of the several states thoughts of a common destiny.

⁵ Wilson, in *Journals of Congress*, VI. 1105. Rush, *ibid.*, 1081. It is to be noted that the large-state men urged the new idea of a national state most strongly, because it was an argument in favor of proportional representation.

reflect that there had to be a dawn of the idea of a national state, and its light naturally touched the highest peaks first—the men capable of noble conceptions—men like Bismarck in Germany or Cavour in Italy—Washington, Hamilton, Wilson, and Madison, and it is in their writings and acts that we find the most advanced views of the powers of Congress.

CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE.

THE SHARPS RIFLE EPISODE IN KANSAS HISTORY

THE Kansas struggle was indeed the prelude to the Civil War. The first armed conflict between the North and the South began, not at Fort Sumter in 1861, but on the Wakarusa and at Lawrence in 1855. The desperate strife for the possession of this virgin soil was the necessary introduction to the awful carnage of the sixties. Many leaders on both sides foresaw with remarkable clearness that an impending crisis was at hand and that Kansas would be a decisive factor in the approaching conflict. Senator Atchison of Missouri, writing in September, 1855, to his Southern friends who were gathered to celebrate the anniversary of the battle at King's Mountain, fervently solicited their aid, saying that "the [Kansas] contest . . . is one of life and death, and it will be so with you and your institution if we fail . . . the stake the 'border ruffians' are playing for is a mighty one . . . in a word, the prosperity or the ruin of the whole South depends on the Kansas struggle."¹ Horace Greeley, but a few months earlier, with equal prophetic vision, wrote his celebrated "Rising Cloud" editorial,² predicting that the great battle between Freedom and Slavery was at hand; that the little cloud hovering over a handful of people in the far West foreshadowed the coming storm; that the distant rumble of the tempest could already be heard, and that the mischief there brewing was not alone for Kansas. No wonder that both sides in this great controversy threw themselves into the contest with such impetuous intensity, such determination and abandonment, often forgetting or ignoring the most vital principles of right action, and yet rising to such lofty exhibitions of heroism, courage, patience, self-sacrifice, and suffering as to move every section of the nation to proffer aid and sympathy. "Bleeding Kansas" became a familiar cry in every hamlet; its echoes reverberating across the Atlantic aroused the compassion of Europe. Lady Byron, sending sixty-five pounds to Mrs. Stowe, requested that the money be spent, not in the purchase of arms, but for the relief of those who had "resisted oppression at the hazard of life and property".³

¹ Letter of September 12, *New York Tribune*, November 2, 1855, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, April 12, 1855.

³ *Ibid.*, November 14, 1856.

It is the purpose of this article to deal with only one phase of this dramatic chapter—the output, source, and distribution of Sharps¹ rifles, “Beecher Bibles”, and other arms furnished to Kansas emigrants during the free-state struggle. The New England Emigrant Aid Company was accused by politicians and pro-slavery partisans of having initiated the policy of arming. A large portion of the press and the non-resistance, Garrisonian abolitionists joined in the cry of condemnation. “Sharps Rifles” became a by-word for dispute and controversy. It absorbed the attention of the United States Senate. Congress appointed committees to discover how, when, and by whom arms were sent to Kansas. It vexed the national executive, and when Thaddeus Hyatt, W. F. M. Arney, and Edward Daniels called on President Pierce, demanding protection for Kansas settlers, the committee was given a cold rebuff and informed that “Bibles rather than . . . Sharps rifles” should have been sent to Kansas.² State political conventions likewise denounced the policy; such a convention at Lexington, Missouri, in 1855, charged the New England Company “with recruiting armies and hiring fanatics to go to Kansas”.³ But Sumner warmly defended the Emigrant Aid Company on the floor of the Senate.⁴

The officers of the company also entered a general denial. Its secretary, Thomas H. Webb, in reply to an inquiry from Sumner, wrote that “the company had never sent, or paid for sending guns, cannon, pistols or other weapons to Kansas . . . The company had sent saw mills, grist mills, various kinds of machinery, also Bibles and a great variety of religious, literary and scientific books.”⁵ Amos A. Lawrence, treasurer, and Anson J. Stone, assistant treasurer, both testified before a Congressional investigating committee that the company had never employed any of its capital for firearms.⁶ A few men openly favored arming the colonists, among whom Henry Ward Beecher stands as the most celebrated. He is reported in the *New York Tribune* as saying that “he believed that the Sharps rifle was a truly *moral* agency, and that there was more moral power in one of those instruments, so far as the slaveholders of Kansas were concerned, than in a hundred Bibles. You

¹ Erroneously spelled “Sharps” and “Sharp’s”. One Christian Sharps was the inventor of the gun; and “Sharps” is the correct form.

² *New York Tribune*, September 3, 1856.

³ *Congressional Globe*, 34 Cong., 1 Sess., Appendix, p. 288.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 537.

⁵ Manuscript Letter-book of New England Emigrant Aid Company, March 14, 1856.

⁶ *Report of the Special Committee on the Troubles in Kansas*, Serial 869, 34 Cong., 1 Sess., House Report 200, pp. 878, 880, 886.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII. — 36.

might just as well . . . read the Bible to Buffaloes as to those fellows who follow Atchison and Stringfellow; but they have a supreme respect for the logic that is embodied in Sharps rifles."¹ From this date Sharps rifles became popularly known as "Beecher Bibles".

As a rule free-state advocates did not speak so frankly. The question of arms forced itself before the Cleveland convention, assembled in June, 1856, to devise means for Kansas relief; but the sentiment expressed by the majority was opposed to such a policy. Dr. Vincent of Chagrin Falls, Ohio, did take the position that Kansas farmers needed "rifles and revolvers"; and Colonel Nichols, a Kansas representative, insisted that protection of life and property was the first great need, that "men will not plow when they expect to be shot in the furrow, they will not build while the incendiary stands ready to apply the torch". But C. W. Younglove of Cleveland, in opposition to such views, said "that Ohio looked to the ballot box rather than to the cartridge box as the remedy for the troubles in Kansas"; while D. Wright of Albany "wanted to hear no talk" about sending armed men to the territory.² It however seems probable that those favoring armed resistance to domination of the border ruffians generally remained silent, but worked all the more vigorously to secure such ends. At any rate the various Kansas aid committees, shortly after the adjournment of this convention, began issuing to the thousands of individuals contributing aid a handsome lithographed certificate, probably designed by William Barnes of Albany, which contained in a conspicuous place the following significant clause from the Federal Constitution: "A well regulated Militia being necessary to the Security of a FREE STATE the Right of the People to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed." Thus in spite of presidential proclamations, indignant politicians, enraged Missouri slaveholders, demagogues, theorists, timid but well-meaning citizens, and the strenuous effort of regular troops, detailed to intercept arms sent across the territorial borders, a large supply was constantly passing into Kansas.

Before detailing how these arms were secured, and how and by whom sent to Kansas, it will be well to recall some historical facts, well known, but essential to this entire subject. Stephen A. Douglas, able, ambitious, unscrupulous, startled the nation in January,

¹ *New York Tribune*, February 8, 1856, p. 6.

² These quotations are from a pamphlet, loaned by Hon. William Barnes, describing the proceedings of the Cleveland and Buffalo conventions of June and July, 1856, pp. 3-4.

1854, by proposing to apply squatter sovereignty to the Kansas-Nebraska country, a territory already consecrated to freedom by the Missouri Compromise of 1820. In May his bill became a law. The abrogation of the Missouri Compromise was complete; Slavery had scored another great triumph; the opposition was paralyzed. But Eli Thayer of Worcester, Massachusetts, came forward as the man of the hour. He would checkmate the pro-slavery programme by colonizing this new territory with free-state men. To accomplish this end he at once chartered the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Company, later rechartered as the New England Emigrant Aid Company, with an authorized capital stock of one million dollars. He secured the assistance and co-operation of many of the ablest men of New England and New York, among the most active being Amos A. Lawrence, Edward Everett Hale, Dr. Samuel Cabot, J. M. S. Williams, Horace Greeley, C. J. Higginson, George L. Stearns, Dr. S. G. Howe, and John Carter Brown.

While the company afforded no direct pecuniary aid to the emigrant, it widely advertised the advantages of the new territory; it organized the emigrants into companies, securing for them mutual aid and protection; travel rates to those going under the auspices of the company were reduced one-half; it established, in advance of emigration, town-sites, such as Lawrence, Topeka, Osawatimie, Manhattan, Hampden, and Wabaunsee, and at these points erected sawmills, grist-mills, school-houses, and churches. These company towns at once became the great free-state centres in the territory. Opposition to the Douglas measure was universal throughout the North, and the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa furnished a larger proportion of free-state settlers than any other section; yet it was this New England company that supplied the plan and the organization and gave the direction and inspiration to the whole free-state movement; and when the prairies of Kansas were swept by fire and sword, it was to the Boston society that the afflicted pioneers first turned for protection, comfort, and material relief.

Dr. Charles Robinson, S. C. Pomeroy, and Charles H. Branscomb were employed to serve the Emigrant Aid Company in Kansas. Pomeroy was the head representative and the purchasing agent for the company. Robinson, however, soon developed as the real leader in general affairs. He was well fitted for such grave responsibility, for he had been through the California troubles, and was by nature shrewd, cool, determined, and an able judge of men and of the future. While other leaders had important and often more picturesque parts, it was the mind of Robinson

that shaped the free-state programme; it was Robinson that stood as the chosen leader of the band of men and women as heroic as the founders of Plymouth and as brave as the farmers who stood in line at Lexington. In August, 1854, the present town-site of Lawrence was established. During that fall seven companies were sent from New England; by June of the following year eleven more entered the promised land. These companies consisted each of from ten to more than two hundred persons. These early settlers were sober, industrious, God-fearing; they generally came unarmed, interested only in peaceable husbandry and in the establishment of a free state.

The easiest approach to the territory was by steamboat through Missouri. As boatload after boatload of detested Yankees and Northern settlers passed up the tawny river, the naturally hospitable Missouri slaveholder was surprised, astounded, then disturbed; and as the volume of Northern emigration swelled in numbers, his soul was filled with fury and bitter hatred. Even at the present day different sections of the Union seriously misjudge each other; but in 1854 an impassable gulf intervened between free and slave sections. They could never fairly comprehend each other's motives. To the slave-owner the "peculiar institution" was God-ordained; it was inextricably bound up with his whole industrial and social system. By what principle did these "pauper" laborers and abolition fanatics dare to approach the borders of western Missouri and disturb the already unstable equilibrium of a slave community? Had it not been agreed that Nebraska should be a free state and that Kansas should be a slave state? Was not this a fair proposition? If threats and bluster would not deter these Northern interlopers, then more serious measures must be employed. In June, 1854, before a single Eastern colony had set foot on Kansas soil, the *Platte County Argus* declared that

they [Northern emigrants] must be met, if need be, with the rifle. We must meet them at the very threshold and scourge them back to their caverns of darkness. They have made the issue, and it is for us to meet and repel them, even at the point of the bayonet.

Prompt steps were taken to put this programme into practice. In October, 1854, an unsuccessful effort was made to drive Robinson and his associates from Lawrence.¹ In November the first territorial election was held. Seventeen hundred and twenty-nine² armed Missourians crossed the border and elected Whitfield delegate to Congress. In the meantime Reeder was appointed governor.

¹ Frank W. Blackmar, *The Life of Charles Robinson* (Topeka, 1902), p. 118.

² Leverett W. Spring, *Kansas* (Boston, 1885), p. 41.

The census taken under his direction in February, 1855, gave the total number of voters in the territory as 2,905.¹

On March 30, 1855, occurred the election for members to both branches of the territorial legislature. This election was of supreme importance. A committee appointed by Congress to investigate it reported that with a fair election the free-state party would have had a majority in both branches.² But unprincipled leaders, at the head of a motley, unwashed mob of ruffians, drunk with bad whisky and armed with cannon and every variety of small arms, overran the border and turned impending defeat into a glorious victory, electing to the legislature every pro-slavery candidate save one. Out of a total of 6,307 votes,³ 4,908 were cast by residents of Missouri. The upholders of slavery were jubilant; the friends of freedom dismayed.

The second Missouri invasion left Kansas prostrate and completely in the hands of the pro-slavery power. According to the dominant crowd at Washington, squatter sovereignty was working successfully. But the free-state settlers indicated no intention of giving up the field. Robinson, prompt in action, boldly proposed to repudiate the "bogus" legislature, arm the free-state people, and defend the sacred rights of the citizens of Kansas. On April 2, only three days after the election, Robinson wrote to Eli Thayer,⁴ describing very completely the Missouri outrages, and appealed for arms:

Our people have now formed themselves into four military companies, and will meet to drill till they have perfected themselves in the art. Also, companies are being formed in other places, and we want *arms*. Give us the weapons and every man from the North will be a soldier and die in his tracks if necessary, to protect and defend our rights. . . .

Cannot your secret society send us 200 Sharps rifles as a loan till this question is settled? Also a couple of field-pieces? If they will do that, I think they will be *well used*, and preserved. I have given our people encouragement to expect something of the kind, and hope we shall not be disappointed. Please inform me what the prospect is in this direction.

If the Governor sets this election aside, we of course must have another, and shall need to be up and dressed.

In great haste,

Very respectfully,

C. ROBINSON.

To Hon. Eli Thayer, Worcester, Mass.

¹ Serial 869, 34 Cong., 1 Sess., House Report 200, p. 9.

² *Ibid.*, 34.

³ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁴ Blackmar, *Life of Robinson*, pp. 131-133.

On April 9 Robinson wrote an almost identical letter to Edward Everett Hale,¹ one of the most active members of the Emigrant Aid Company, strongly urging that two hundred rifles and two field-pieces be sent at once to Lawrence. But, not satisfied with the uncertainties of correspondence, he now despatched George W. Deitzler, who was in his employ as clerk of the Emigrant Company, with a second letter to Thayer again asking for rifles. Mr. Deitzler, who later attained the rank of brigadier-general during the Civil War, described the result of this mission in a letter written for the "Old Settlers' Meeting" in 1879, in which he tells of his appointment by Robinson and his trip to Worcester and Boston, and how he got the desired Sharps rifles:

Within an hour after our arrival in Boston, the executive committee of the Emigrant Aid Society held a meeting and delivered to me an order for one hundred Sharps rifles and I started at once for Hartford, arriving there on Saturday evening. The guns were packed on the following Sunday and I started for home on Monday morning. The boxes were marked "Books." I took the precaution to have the (cap) cones removed from the guns and carried them in my carpet sack, which sack would have been missing in the event of the capture of the guns by the enemy. . . .

I have not referred to this transaction from any motives of personal vanity, but simply to revive a feeling of gratitude toward Mr. Thayer and his associates for the kind and patriotic assistance rendered by them to the free state people from the beginning to the end of the great struggle which terminated, happily, in the overthrow of American Slavery, and to show how promptly they gave attention to the business which took me to Boston. Those rifles did good service in the "border war." . . . It was perhaps the first shipment of arms for our side and it incited a healthy feeling among the unarmed free state settlers, which permeated and energized them until even the Quakers were ready to fight.²

The Boston end of this transaction appears in the following letter from the secretary of the New England aid society which has but recently come to notice:³

No. 3 Winter St.

Boston, May 8th 1855.

Dr. Charles Robinson,

Dear Sir:

Mr. Deitzler presented himself at this office on Wednesday last, with a letter from Mr. Thayer relative to a certain business intrusted to him; no one in this *village* having received any advices.

We were busily occupied in getting ready for special meeting No. 2,

¹ MS. private letters in possession of Edward Everett Hale.

² Charles S. Gleed (editor), *The Kansas Memorial, a Report of the Old Settlers' Meeting held at Bismarck Grove, Kansas, September 15th and 16th, 1879* (Kansas City, Mo., 1880), pp. 184-185.

³ From MS. Letter-book of New England Emigrant Aid Company, vol. I., p. 146.

called by special invitation to see if we could raise funds for more Mills; still considering the exigencies of the case we ventured to lend a helping hand to help forward the movement, although by so doing we pushed out for the time being, as we apprehended would be the case, our legitimate business. I eventually arranged, with the aid of Dr. Cabot, so as to take the risk of ordering, in all one hundred machines, at a cost of about three thousand dollars, taking our chances hereafter to raise the money. I shall obligate myself to the subscribers to return these in due time or a satisfactory equivalent therefore, should they on trial be approved and meet with purchasers. You will therefore govern yourself accordingly and deliver them to none but trustworthy individuals.

I am free to say, had your letter [a letter received after the arrival of Deitzler, describing some of the factious conditions in Lawrence] arrived forty-eight hours earlier, myself and others would have been little, if at all disposed to exert ourselves, as we have done, at so much expense of time and money, to procure machines for the improvement of Lawrence. Rather we should have seconded the suggestion of one of our most influential coadjutors, which was to advise you and other friends to quit L., abandon it to its impending fate, and seek a location at another spot, where more harmony and good will would be likely to prevail.

We shall await with much interest further intelligence from you in relation to the matters herein referred to. Please telegraph us the result of the election at the earliest moment, and write us the details before the intelligence becomes stale. Hoping that all will yet come out right, I remain,

Yours truly,

THOMAS H. WEBB.

This first shipment of rifles soon reached Kansas. A correspondent for the *Milwaukee Sentinel*,¹ writing from Lawrence, May 23, states that intense excitement was produced in the minds of pro-slavery people by the arrival "of five boxes of *books*, which, on being opened, proved to be, instead of books, one hundred of Sharps rifles". Threats and imprecations were loud and long. The Emigrant Aid Company was denounced as trying to overawe Western men. Even James H. Lane, who had but recently come to Kansas and was still in sympathy with the pro-slavery element, urged sending the rifles back to Massachusetts.² They never went back. The very name "Sharps rifle" was to become a term to sober the border ruffian and give him serious pause. This breech-loading rifle was a new invention and extremely effective:³ in comparison, the Missourian was poorly armed, carrying either a squirrel-rifle, a heavy buffalo-gun, or a clumsy army musket. This difference in

¹ Charles Robinson, *The Kansas Conflict* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1898), p. 128.

² *New York Tribune*, June 15, 1855, p. 6.

³ The Sharps rifle "is one of the very oldest successful guns of the breech-loading class, and the first in which a vertically sliding breech-block was employed." E. H. Knight, *American Mechanical Dictionary*, s. v. Rifle.

armament probably explains why the free-state hands, though usually outnumbered, were invariably victorious in all open fighting.

Several other letters have been found in reference to this first shipment of arms, but give little additional information. The following extract from a letter written July 15, 1855, by Amos A. Lawrence, treasurer of the Emigrant Aid Company, to Franklin Pierce, however, shows how thoroughly this rich Boston merchant had entered into the Kansas struggle. He boldly tells the President that since the government had given no protection to the settlers in Kansas and since "they must defend *themselves*; and therefore many persons here who refused at first (myself included) have rendered them assistance, by furnishing them the means of defense."¹

But Robinson was not satisfied with one hundred rifles, and stirred up his kinsman, Lawrence, who on July 20, 1855, writes to the secretary, Thomas H. Webb: "When farmers turn soldiers they must have *arms*. Write to Hartford and get their terms for one hundred more of the Sharps rifles at once."² Here is the beginning of the second installment of rifles. About the same time James B. Abbott was sent from the territory on a mission similar to the one which carried Deitzler to Boston. These letters tell the story:³

LAWRENCE, July 26, 1855.

Mr. Thayer—Dear Sir: The bearer, J. B. Abbott, is a resident of this district, on the Wakarusa, about four miles from Lawrence. There is a military company formed in his neighborhood, and they are anxious to procure arms. Mr. Abbott is a gentleman in whom you can place implicit confidence, and is true as steel to the cause of freedom in Kansas. In my judgment the rifles in Lawrence have had a *very good* effect, and I think the same kind of instruments in other places would do more to save Kansas than almost anything else. Anything you can do for Mr. Abbott will be gratefully appreciated by the people of Kansas. We are in the midst of a revolution, as you will see by the papers. How we shall come out of the furnace, God only knows. That we have got to enter it, some of us, there is no doubt; but we are ready to be offered.

In haste, very respectfully yours, for freedom for a world,

C. ROBINSON.

Upon the above letter appear the following two indorsements, which tell their own story:

OFFICE OF THE NEW ENGLAND EMIGRANT AID COMPANY,
No. 3 Winter street, BOSTON, Aug. 10, 1855.

Dr. Charles Robinson, within mentioned, is an agent of the Emigrant

¹ William Lawrence, *Life of Amos A. Lawrence* (Boston, 1888), p. 95.

² *Ibid.*, 96.

³ *Transactions of the Kansas State Historical Society*, vol. I-II. (Topeka, 1881), p. 222.

Aid Company, and is worthy of implicit confidence. We cheerfully recommend Mr. J. B. Abbott to the public.

C. H. BRANSCOMB, *Secretary pro tem.*

Boston, August 11, 1855.¹

Dear Sir: Request Mr. Palmer to have one hundred Sharps rifles packed in casks, like hardware, and to retain them subject to my order. Also to send the bill to me by mail. I will pay it either with my note, according to the terms agreed on between him and Dr. Webb, or in cash less interest at seven per cent. per annum.

Yours truly,

AMOS A. LAWRENCE.

Mr. J. B. Abbott, care of A. Rogers, Hartford, Conn.

A second letter to Abbott is as follows:

Boston, August 20, 1855.²

My Dear Sir: This installment of carbines is far from being enough, and I hope the measures you are taking will be followed up until every organized company of trusty men in the Territory shall be supplied. Dr. Cabot will give me the names of any gentlemen here who subscribe money, and the amount—of which I shall keep a memorandum, and promise them that it shall be repaid either in cash, or in rifles, whenever it is settled that Kansas shall not be a province of Missouri. Therefore, keep them in capital order, and above all, take good care that they do not fall into the hands of the Missourians after you once get them into use.

You must dispose of these where they will do the most good, and for this purpose you should advise with Dr. Robinson and Mr. Pomeroy.

Yours truly,

AMOS A. LAWRENCE.

Mr. James B. Abbott, care of A. Rogers, Hartford.

Among the Lawrence papers can still be found the identical memorandum above mentioned giving a full list of these subscribers; the memorandum is indorsed in the handwriting of Mr. Lawrence as follows:

Money received from various persons to make up the sum expended by me for rifles for the defense of the Kansas settlers. \$2,670 or thereabouts. Aug. 24, 1855.

The list of subscribers, in the writing of Dr. Cabot, is as follows:

Dr. Cabot	240	Henry Lee	50
Cunningham Bro.	100	P. S. Crowell	25
Wendell Phillips	100	Gerrit Smith	250
J. M. Forbes	300	W. R. Lawrence	100
J. Bertram	100	Calvin Hall	50
G. Howland Shaw	100	L. B. Russell	25
Sam A. Eliot	100	E. R. Hoar	25
Theo Lyman	100	Sam Hoar	50
		A. A. Lawrence	955

¹ *Ibid*, 223.

² *Ibid*.

In the same collection is also a brief note dated September 25, 1855, from J. M. S. Williams, another very prominent director of the company, in which he says he "encloses a check for one hundred dollars for the Kansas 'Books'".

Abbott, after securing the order for one hundred rifles from the officers of the Emigrant Aid friends, proceeded to Hartford, Providence, and New York City for the purpose of getting one hundred additional guns, but could raise only enough funds to purchase seventeen rifles.¹ The entire lot was hurried to Kansas, to be used if need be in the October election for delegates to the Topeka Constitutional Convention.² These rifles were intended only to defend the rights of the settlers against Missouri interference. On August 10 Lawrence had written Robinson, approving resistance to bogus laws, but counselled that no resistance should be made to the federal government,³ a policy consistently followed by Robinson and the Boston society throughout the entire struggle.

Major Abbott spent several weeks in New York City. On August 18 he wrote Amos Lawrence:

I came to this city yesterday and have seen some of the gentlemen to whom I have letters. They all seemed to favor the measure after a little *hesitation* and I doubt not we shall be able to get something here that will not only strengthen the hearts but the hands of our friends in Kansas.⁴

Greeley, Field, Priestly, Elliot, and Perkins are named as giving assistance. But he seems to have especially interested Frederick Law Olmsted, the well-known writer of antislavery literature, whom he appointed "Acting Commissioner" to raise funds for the Kansas cause, sufficient in amount to purchase another hundred Sharps rifles. Olmsted secured only about four hundred dollars, which, on the advice of a veteran army officer, he invested in a howitzer and some ammunition.⁵ The gun left New York in October; it reached Lawrence in December at the beginning of the Wakarusa war. On May 21, 1856, at the sacking of Lawrence, this gun was carried off by Captain H. T. Titus and his South Carolina men. Captain Samuel Walker, of the Lawrence guards, pledged himself to its recovery within six months' time. Well did he keep his promise. On August 16 he stormed Fort Titus, captured its commander, and then extorted from Governor Shannon a stipulation

¹ *Transactions of the Kansas Historical Society*, I-II. 221.

² *Ibid.*

³ Lawrence, *Life of Lawrence*, pp. 99-101.

⁴ Amos A. Lawrence Collection of MS. letters.

⁵ *Transactions of the Kansas Historical Society*, I-II. 224.

that the howitzer, which had not yet been retaken, should be exchanged for his distinguished prisoner.¹ During the troubles in southeastern Kansas, some years later, the howitzer was brought into prominent service, and in 1861 was carried by Lane into Missouri.² The gun is now on exhibition in the rooms of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka, and is known as the Abbott Howitzer.

The next phase of the rifle question comes under the direction of Dr. Samuel Cabot, perhaps the most active Boston director of the Emigrant Aid Company. He rarely missed attending the weekly executive committee meetings of that organization. The executive committee seems to have appointed him as a special committee on "rifles" during the summer of 1855, but the only notice found is in a letter by Webb to Lawrence, dated January 29, 1856,³ stating that "Dr. Cabot is treasurer of the Rifle fund." He was a man of few words, but active and influential; he was in thorough harmony with the policy of arming the prairie colonists and devoted much of his professional time to this service. A very few of Dr. Cabot's papers still exist, and are now in the possession of the Massachusetts Historical Society. The most important number in this collection is a small account-book, which contains no comments; all accounts are in the writing of Dr. Cabot, and on one cover, in pencil, also in the hand of Dr. Cabot, appears the single but significant word "Rifles". This account-book was clearly intended for personal use, hence some of the memoranda are indefinite; but the main features are clear and complete. The name of every donor, with amount given, is listed. The first collection was made in August, 1855, the last one September 18, 1857. About \$12,500 passed through Dr. Cabot's hands for the defense of the free-state people in Kansas. The bulk of these contributions came from New England, a few from New York state, and \$2,500 from the Kansas National Aid Committee. Under expenditures, it appears that the largest sums were paid to Palmer and Company, agents for Sharps rifles; the various items, including a draft for \$2,500 to Pomeroy, aggregating about \$8,000 and good for about 325 rifles. Of the remainder, one thousand is paid to A. A. Lawrence on the previous rifle account, and the balance is expended for revolvers, bowie-knives, ammunition, and general expenses.

One of the bills of account of the Sharps manufacturing com-

¹ *Ibid.*, 226.

² *Ibid.*, 224.

³ Amos A. Lawrence Collection.

pany is still preserved among the Cabot papers.¹ This bill was drawn on S. C. Pomeroy, purchasing agent of the Emigrant Aid Company in Kansas; but the rifles listed in it were for a long time in the hands of the "enemy". Along with four breech-loading cannon, these rifles were originally placed in the care of David Starr Hoyt, of Deerfield, to be conveyed by him to Kansas Territory.² While he was on board the river steamboat *Arabia*, a letter written by Hoyt to his mother, announcing his successful departure from St. Louis and describing how his precious guns were safe in the hold of the vessel, fell into the hands of the captain of the *Arabia*. The letter was read by the captain to the passengers, many of whom were border ruffians, and created intense excitement. A mob took possession of Hoyt and his companion, William B. Parsons, and voted to throw them into the Missouri River, but were persuaded from this course by Charles Keurney of Westport. When the boat tied up at Lexington, it was surrounded by a thousand armed Missourians. Hoyt was ordered by the leaders of the mob to sign a surrender of the arms, but although repeatedly threatened with death, he positively refused; the arms were then forcibly removed. All that Hoyt could show S. C. Pomeroy, whom he met some hours later in Kansas City, was a schedule indorsed "Taken from D. S. Hoyt the following described property, to be delivered to the order of Wilson Shannon, Governor of Kansas Territory, or his successor in office". The guns, however, were useless, as Dr. Calvin Cutter had carried the breech-blocks to Kansas by a different route, an action characterized by the border ruffians as a "d—— Yankee trick".

Hoyt at once returned to St. Louis, libelled the *Arabia*, and collected the full value of the arms given up by the officers of the boat

¹"Hartford, Ct., March 19, 1856.

Gen'l Sam'l C. Pomeroy,			Dr.
To Sharps Rifle Manufacturing Co.,			
For 100 Carbines,	@ \$30	3,000.00	
Less 10 %		300.00	
			2,700.00
" 29 Sharps Primers	@ \$1½	32.62	
" 20 Bullet Moulds (Box 50 c)	@ \$1	20.50	
" 10 Boxes	@ \$2	20.00	
			\$2,773.12
By draft on S. Cabot, Jr., 1 day sight	\$1,286.56		
" this amount allowed as agreed	200.00	1,486.56	
			\$1,286.56 "
Balance due			

The bill also contains a complete list of the numbers of each rifle.

²A full account is given in "David Starr Hoyt", by William B. Parsons, *Kansas Magazine*, II. 42-45.

at Lexington. Several weeks later the brave Hoyt was treacherously murdered near Fort Saunders by his inveterate enemies, but the rifles continued to make history. The Boston gentlemen were naturally anxious to secure possession of this property, but felt a little awkward and embarrassed. "If we were not officers of the Emigrant Aid Company we could get them by suit," wrote Lawrence, "but whether we can do so by proxy remains to be seen." In 1857 Governor Geary signed an order for these arms, but it was only after a lengthy suit, brought in 1858-1859, in the name of the law firm of Knox and Kellogg, St. Louis, that the company's agents finally recovered them.¹

Probably owing to the recent foray of John Brown into Missouri, the company seemed loath to forward these rifles to Kansas, finally doing so on the solicitation of Martin F. Conway, who had taken Pomeroy's post as the general Kansas agent. Only one paragraph of his letter, March 10, 1859, in reference to this matter need here be inserted:

I am not absolutely sure that we shall have no further use for arms in Kansas, though the probability is in that direction. This skin hunting business may engender a strife with Missouri. We cannot tell what [a] day or an hour may bring forth in this matter. But even supposing Kansas out of the question, the arms had better be here than in Boston, or even in St. Louis, for if they are needed against the Slave Power, I take it that the first point of need will be South and Southwest of us.² I shall therefore, dispatch an order for them. I do not see how they would be in greater danger here than in St. Louis.³

Thus these rifles were finally brought to Kansas. John Brown's raid into southwest Missouri had invited retaliatory raids into Kansas. Hence after several urgent requests these particular rifles were transferred in 1860 to James Montgomery and employed by him in the Fort Scott troubles.⁴

Eli Thayer probably gave more money for arming Kansas settlers than any other person: according to his own testimony he contributed \$4,500 "for the purchase of rifles and cannon".⁵ Only a portion of his expenditures have been traced; the Cabot account shows a donation by Thayer of five hundred dollars. In 1855 he sent two cases of Millbury rifles to Kansas, containing forty guns, and valued at one thousand dollars.⁶ At a public meeting, February 9, 1856, in the city hall of Worcester, Thayer assisted in raising

¹ See Cabot Collection, Massachusetts Historical Society.

² Probably referring to the secret efforts of the Emigrant Aid Company to inaugurate antislavery colonization in Texas.

³ Cabot Collection.

⁴ See Montgomery letters, Cabot Collection.

⁵ Eli Thayer, *The New England Emigrant Aid Company* (Worcester, 1887), p. 46.

⁶ Letter of T. W. Higginson, Cabot Collection.

money for the purchase of twenty-three Sharps rifles, he himself contributing ten of this number.¹ The minutes² of the executive committee of the free-state party at Lawrence reveal still further activity by Thayer in this business. But it is impossible to catalogue all the arms furnished directly or indirectly by the directors of the Emigrant Aid Company. Enough has been given to show the great activity of the members of this organization and the large scale on which arms were furnished to the free-state people.

Through the efforts of Thayer a Connecticut Kansas colony was organized in New Haven, including many Yale graduates; and it started west on March 31, 1856. A few days before, a farewell service was held in North Church, Henry Ward Beecher delivering the address. Professor Benjamin Silliman presided at this meeting, and at its conclusion stated that no provision had been made for properly equipping the party with arms: he therefore appealed to the audience to provide fifty rifles. Beecher promptly responded, agreeing to give \$625, which would pay for half the number, if the other half should be given by those present.³ The full amount was soon secured. On the following day the senior class of Yale College purchased an extra rifle for Hon. C. B. Lines, the leader of the party. On the day of departure Beecher was again present and presented each man in the company with a Bible and a Sharps rifle.

"We gratefully accept the bibles," said the leader of the colony, "as the only sure foundation on which to erect free institutions. . . . We . . . accept the weapons also, and, like our fathers, we go with the bible to indicate the peaceful nature of our mission and the harmless character of our company, and a weapon to teach those who may be disposed to molest us (if any such there be) that while we determine to do that which is right we will not submit tamely to that which is wrong." "We will not forget you," said [Mr.] Beecher. . . . "Every morning breeze shall catch the blessings of our prayers and roll them westward to your prairie home."⁴

The combined stupidity and criminality of Pierce, in permitting the sacking of Lawrence and the wide-spread reign of murder and pillage in the territory, created a passionate feeling of indignation throughout the North. The ashes of Lawrence, the outpost of freedom, and the blood of the fallen in Kansas must be avenged. "Money, Sharps rifles, recruits", was the angry cry. The *New York Tribune*, on the suggestion of a subscriber, announced that it would receive one-dollar subscriptions for Kansas relief; in a very

¹ Eli Thayer, *A History of the Kansas Crusade* (New York, 1889), p. 176; *New York Tribune*, February 15, 1856.

² *Transactions of the Kansas Historical Society*, VII. 525.

³ Gleed, *The Kansas Memorial*, p. 122.

⁴ Spring, *Kansas*, p. 165.

brief time over \$22,000 was subscribed, most of it in dollar sums.¹ Aid committees sprang into existence in almost every Northern village. These in turn were consolidated into state committees. How far all these organizations furnished arms cannot at present be determined. The committees in Massachusetts, New York, and Wisconsin were exceptionally active. No account has been found of the expenditures of the Wisconsin committee. The Kansas Committee of New York published a full report, and according to this report \$643.37 was expended for Sharps rifles. In the secretary's minutes of April, 1856, of that organization there appears a letter to Pomeroy stating that the committee had purchased twenty-five Sharps rifles, thus corresponding with the treasurer's report.

The Kansas State Committee of Massachusetts had been gradually evolved from a subcommittee of the Emigrant Aid Company. As it developed, it finally came under the efficient management of George L. Stearns. This committee raised over \$48,000 and a large amount of clothing for Kansas sufferers. The treasurer's report of this committee is among the Emigrant Aid Company's papers, and records the fact that five thousand (\$4,947.88) dollars was expended for two hundred Sharps rifles. But these rifles never reached Kansas: they were consigned to the National Committee and by them transported to Tabor, Iowa. Before they could be taken to Kansas, Geary, with the co-operation of the free-state leaders, had established peace, and such military bands as were not incorporated into the state militia were either disarmed or driven from the territory.

John Brown now entered as an applicant for the Tabor rifles; his fighting on the border had given birth to plans destined to bear final fruit at Harpers Ferry; but his application was refused by the National Committee lest he might use them in another expedition into Missouri.² Brown, however, had strong sympathizers at Boston, and, on the demand of the officers of the Massachusetts Kansas Committee, which had originally furnished these arms, the Tabor rifles were restored to the Massachusetts committee³ and then turned over by its president to John Brown. In due season, these two hundred Sharps rifles, originally intended for the defense of the free-state people in Kansas, were carried by Brown to the neighborhood of Harpers Ferry⁴ and there captured by the Maryland militiamen.

The organization of the Kansas National Aid Committee came as

¹ *New York Tribune*, January 23, 1857.

² Serial 1040, 36 Cong., 1 Sess., Senate Report 278, pp. 245, 247.

³ *Ibid.*, 226-249, *passim*.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 7, 51, 236-237.

a climax to the various state efforts to aid the free-state cause. The movement for a national committee was general, but exceptionally vigorous in Ohio; final organization was effected at Buffalo in July, 1856. Thayer and Barnes planned the details of this committee; Thaddeus Hyatt was chosen president; and the committee had headquarters in Chicago, with Harvey B. Hurd as secretary and Horace White as assistant secretary. At the only general meeting of the committee, held in New York City, January, 1857, it was reported that two thousand emigrants and fifty tons of clothing had been sent to Kansas; and that the committee had raised and expended ninety thousand dollars in the direct aid and support of the free-state cause.¹ The men composing the two thousand emigrants were generally armed, many of these arms being furnished by the National Committee; but since no printed report was ever made of its expenditures, it is impossible to give details. Fortunately there exists the testimony of Horace White, given before the Harpers Ferry Congressional investigating committee, in which he states that the National Committee expended about ten thousand dollars for arms.² This then must be accepted as the amount spent by the Chicago organization for arming purposes.

At least one free state furnished arms direct from its arsenal for fighting in Kansas. Iowa had sent many of her sons to the territory and, being so near the border, was materially interested in the conflict. Governor Grimes had also written President Pierce that Iowa could not remain indifferent to the treatment of the free-state people in Kansas. In the spring of 1856 pro-slavery warriors patrolled the Missouri River and excluded Northern emigrants from that great highway. Emigration was now forced to follow the wagon-road through Iowa and Nebraska; and in August, 1856, some five hundred persons had collected in southwestern Iowa, preparatory to crossing into Kansas. This is the so-called "Jim Lane Army"; for though Lane had only a small part in collecting these men, he understood thoroughly the art of self-advertisement, and by means of Eastern newspaper correspondents was given credit for the "whole thing". Thaddeus Hyatt and Dr. S. G. Howe, on behalf of the National Committee, forced Lane from his assumed leadership,³ not even permitting him to accompany the party into the state. Richardson had gathered an army of border ruffians to intercept these emigrants from Iowa; and while most of the incoming free-state men carried arms,

¹ *New York Tribune*, January 27, 1857.

² Serial 1040, 36 Cong., 1 Sess., Senate Report 278, p. 247.

³ *New York Tribune*, August 11, 1856; see also *Transactions of Kansas Historical Society*, VIII. 308-309.

there was a large need for an extra supply. Robert Morrow of Lawrence, one of the leaders, now applied to Governor Grimes for additional arms; and his own statement tells what was accomplished:

[The Governor] said if I could get them without compromising him I could do so. I had letters to some good friends of Kansas; they got the keys to the arsenal, and in the night we loaded up three wagons with 200 stands of arms, and they were put into Colonel Eldridge's train and brought into Kansas.¹

Geary in the meantime had been made executive of the territory. He promptly ordered out five hundred regulars, dispersed Richardson's army, and captured two hundred and forty free-state men under Eldridge, who claimed to be *bona fide* settlers and were set free by the Governor and permitted to keep their individual arms; but the other implements of war, enumerated in the following report by the United States marshal,² he retained:

Three boxes of navy-revolver pistols, all new, viz.: 6 six- and 5 five-shooters; 12 Colt's, navy size; 24 Colt's, navy size; 4 boxes fixed ball cartridges; 1 bag caps; a small lot rifle cartridges; 1 box, 10 Sharps rifles; 145 breech-loading muskets; 85 percussion muskets; 115 bayonets; 61 common sabres; 2 officers' sabres, 1½ kegs of powder; 61 dragoon saddles; 1 drum.

The party had also started with a field-piece, but on hearing of the approach of Cooke's dragoons buried the cannon in a well, where it remains to the present day. While the party was loath to give up these arms, its members had no intention or desire to resist Uncle Sam. A year later Governor Denver, rather against his will, was persuaded to restore this entire capture of arms to Eldridge and his men.

Very little has been found as to the arming of parties from Missouri and the South. Nearly all the pro-slavery fighting men came from western Missouri, which had long been the frontier, and whose inhabitants invariably possessed arms of some sort. The following extracts from W. M. Paxton's *Annals of Platte County* explain how some of the pro-slavery men secured arms for the invasion of Kansas:

Nov. 27, 1855. Liberty Arsenal was surprised and taken by sixty pro-slavery men, who took a large supply of arms and ammunition. Two wagon-loads were brought to Platte City and hid under the Baptist church, then just finished.³

May-20, 1857. A squad of thirty five men was raised in Platte, and crossed at Deleware, taking two brass six-pounders. They were organized as Missouri militia, and armed by the state. They went to Lawrence by way of Franklin.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, 305.

² *Ibid.*, IV. 608.

³ W. M. Paxton, *Annals of Platte County, Missouri*, p. 209.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII. — 37:

When Jones and Atchison attempted to destroy Lawrence in December, 1855, their army of fifteen hundred invaders was partially equipped from the state armories at Independence and Lexington. Colonel J. M. Buford, who left Montgomery, Alabama, in April, 1856, with three hundred followers, came to Kansas unarmed. On leaving Mobile the members of the party were presented each with a Bible, intended as a rebuke to Beecher. Buford originally intended to have his men go armed, but gave up the plan in deference to President Pierce's proclamation of the previous February.¹ Each man carried only a revolver and a bowie-knife. The expedition reached Kansas late in April; and, under the pro-slavery administration of Shannon, Buford's men were promptly enrolled as members of the Kansas militia, armed, and paid from the territorial treasury.² Companies formed in Missouri were equipped in like manner from the Kansas armory. It was these troops that sacked Lawrence and later established themselves at Franklin, Fort Saunders, Hickory Point, and Bull Creek. During August and September they were driven from these fortified stations by armed free-state bands. But the arms issued to the Buford and Missouri companies were never returned. Geary seems to have suspected as much and called on Cramer, inspector-general, to report the disposition of territorial arms; the awkward position of the inspector is seen from his report, dated Lecompton, K. T., October 2, 1856, of which a portion reads:³

As I have stated to your Excellency a short time since, the arms were received here upon the eve of an outbreak, and were furnished the different corps of the militia in a hurried and informal manner, and the captains of the different companies never appeared at my office to give bond according to law. . . .

A large portion of the arms issued to the militia have been captured by the insurgents, though what number I have not been able to ascertain. . . .

Hoping the above may be satisfactory under the present circumstances, I respectfully submit it.

THOMAS J. B. CRAMER,

Inspector General, Kansas Militia.

His Excellency John W. Geary.

A tabulation of the arms furnished to free-state settlers in Kansas, so far as can be ascertained, is as follows:

¹ Walter L. Fleming, "The Buford Expedition to Kansas", *Transactions of the Alabama Historical Society*, IV, 174-175.

² *Ibid.*, 182-183.

³ *Transactions of the Kansas Historical Society*, IV, 592.

Date	Furnished By	Articles	Cost
May, 1855	New England Emigrant Aid Co.	100 Sharps rifles and ammunition	\$3,000.00
August, "	New England Emigrant Aid Co.	100 " " " "	2,670.00
" "	Abbott	17 " " " "	425.00
Sept., "	Olmsted	1 howitzer " "	400.00
" "	Thayer	40 Millbury "	1,000.00
1855 and 1856	Cabot Account ¹	Sharps rifles, revolvers, etc.	12,443.63
Feb., 1856	Thayer and others	23 Sharps rifles	575.00
March, "	Beecher " "	51 " "	1,275.00
" "	Thayer " "	4 breech-loading cannon	1,330.00
April, "	New York Kansas Committee	25 Sharps rifles and ammunition	643.37
July and August, 1856	National Kansas Committee	Arms and ammunition	10,000.00
August, "	T. W. Higginson ²	Arms	364.38
" "	parties		
" "	Massachusetts Kansas Committee	200 Sharps rifles	4,947.88
Sept., "	State of Iowa	200 muskets (value estimated)	4,000.00
Total, \$43,074.26			

The above list is far from complete. It probably contains some duplication; but it is under, rather than above, the true amount. Arms were furnished from Wisconsin and also probably by associations in Ohio; the town of Grinnell, Iowa, raised sufficient funds to purchase fifteen rifles;³ similar reports were announced from other centres, but not on evidence sufficiently definite to be here included. The total amount raised for arms by the various Northern associations must have exceeded fifty thousand dollars. To this amount should then be added the value of arms carried to Kansas by private individuals; but the determination of such amounts does not come within the limits of this paper.

An examination of all the data herein given shows how extensively every section of the North was involved in supplying arms to the free-state forces in Kansas. In recent years various persons have been credited with the first honors in this business, but there is only one association that can claim first place—the directors and officers of the New England Emigrant Aid Company. These officers under oath denied that the company had ever sent arms to the territory.⁴ Technically, this was probably true, as none of the funds subscribed for the company's stock was thus expended; but practically the company was directly responsible for arming Kansas emigrants. It was the company's agent, Robinson, who applied to its chief director for arms; it was the company's executive committee

¹ From Cabot account-book.

² From personal account-book of Colonel T. W. Higginson.

³ *New York Tribune*, July 16, 1856.

⁴ Serial 869, 34 Cong., 1 Sess., House Report 200, pp. 884, 886.

that voted to send the first hundred Sharps rifles sent to the territory; evidence is all but conclusive that these first hundred rifles were partially paid for from donated funds already in the hands of the company's treasurer; it was through the company's agents that these and other arms were purchased, and on them the bills were drawn; and finally the arms were consigned to the company's agents in Kansas and distributed under their supervision. Moreover it was the officers and friends of the company that supplied more than half the arms sent to Kansas, and sent them out in such season as to afford the maximum of protection to those fighting for the free-state cause; many of the arms sent out by other organizations either never reached the territory, or arrived too late to be of real service.

Were the New England Emigrant Aid Company and other organizations justifiable in sending arms to Kansas? Rather, would any other course have been weak and cowardly? The New England company probably understood the exact conditions in Kansas better than did even the administration in Washington. Each week scores of letters from every important point in the territory came to the Boston office, and the most important were carefully read to the directors by Secretary Webb at the weekly executive meeting. The gentlemen that constituted this directorate were sober, honest, patriotic men; they could hardly be called abolitionists. They had induced their friends and neighbors to go to Kansas; when the crisis came, they stood by their compatriots with manly courage and openly informed the President at Washington that they had sent arms to Kansas.¹ The policy adopted by the New England Emigrant Aid Company was indorsed and followed a year later by every Kansas aid committee in the North. The arming of the free-state settlers was not an act of aggression, but purely a measure for protection and defense. The winning of Kansas was a great and important victory for Freedom. Here the slave power received its first stunning defeat, a defeat in which Sharps rifles were decisive factors.

W. H. ISELY.

¹ Lawrence, *Life of Lawrence*, p. 95.

THE ATTITUDE OF THADDEUS STEVENS TOWARD THE CONDUCT OF THE CIVIL WAR

FROM July, 1861, to his death in 1869 Thaddeus Stevens was the leader of the Republican majority of the House of Representatives. He was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House throughout the war, and his attention was therefore largely devoted to questions of taxation and finance, of revenues and appropriations. These subjects in time of war offer a large field of study in connection with Stevens. But the purpose of this paper is not to consider Stevens's contributions and services on these lines, but rather to bring into review his career and opinions in relation particularly to the more distinctly constitutional, political, and party issues which the war presented.

There are three salient aspects about which the political movements and controversies of the Civil War may best be organized and studied: first, the relation of the war to slavery; second, the relation of the war to the Constitution; third, the effect of the war upon the political status of the seceded states and their relation to the Federal Union. These, together with the increased war powers of the President, present the essential issues and phases of the struggle in which the student of war politics will be most concerned. I shall attempt to summarize or bring into brief review Stevens's record upon these salient features of the war.

Stevens recognized as clearly as any man then in public life the seriousness of the great conflict in which the country was engaged, and in the councils of the nation he constantly insisted upon promptness, energy, and determination of purpose. To him it was perfectly clear that the slaveholders were trying to destroy the Union to save slavery; he would, therefore, destroy slavery to save the Union. The Southern states had violated the Constitution to gain their independence; Stevens would give them none of the benefits of the Constitution in the war that it was found necessary to wage upon them. These states had of their own free will repudiated the Constitution and withdrawn from the Union. He would no longer recognize them as sister states under the aegis of law, but having subdued them as a belligerent enemy he would hold and govern them as conquered provinces. These principles of action he laid down in the

beginning, and in the pursuance of them he was clear, consistent, and undeviating from first to last. Firm of purpose and clear of vision, he had no manner of doubt as to the course the nation should pursue in the varying phases of the struggle for the Union. No one need to have been left in doubt as to his policies and plans, for among the membership of the national House he stood pre-eminent as a man with the qualities that a public man most needs in such a time—dauntless courage, a conscience of his own, opinions of his own, and a will of his own. He encountered no superior in intellectual combat, and in the fight he was appointed to endure he well fulfilled the canons of the strenuous game—he never flinched, he fouled no man, and he hit the line hard. An unconquerable fighter, he seemed made for a time of war, a time of storm and stress, and, his enemies themselves being the judges, he stood foursquare to all the winds of opposition that came. These characteristics, together with the times in which he lived and the problems which he faced, make Stevens one of the most memorable figures in our Congressional annals. I proceed to notice his war career with reference to the three aspects of the war to which I have referred—slavery, the Constitution, and the status of the states.

The evidence is conclusive that it was not the original purpose of the nation in the Civil War to interfere with slavery. If it had been but a hundred days' war, it would probably have ended with slavery intact. Hostile intention against slavery was specifically disclaimed. Mr. Lincoln disclaimed it on behalf of the executive, and the two houses of Congress disclaimed it on behalf of the legislative branch of the government.

At the beginning of the war, two days after the battle of Bull Run, Congress passed almost unanimously, in both Houses, the famous Crittenden resolutions setting forth the objects of the war. These resolutions recited, in substance, that the war was not prosecuted for the purpose of subjugating the Southern states—that is, of overthrowing their state governments and reducing them to provinces; nor for the purpose of interfering with slavery in the states, but to defend and maintain the Constitution and the laws, and to preserve the Union with all the equality and rights of the several states unimpaired. The war should accomplish these ends and no more. This resolution voiced at the time the public opinion of the country, and almost the unanimous opinion of the Republican party. President Lincoln represented this opinion, and in a conservative spirit he attempted at first to conduct the war without interfering with slavery, on the assumption that the status of the states and their relation to the Union had not changed.

But the war made all the difference in the world. The events of but a few short months of war wrought a decided change in the purpose and temper of Congress and the country. It was seen that slavery was a source of strength to the Rebellion. Conservative Union men were being rapidly and radically convinced that if the national government did not interfere with slavery, slavery would seriously interfere with the national government and the success of its arms. This change in policy and purpose is indicated by the fact that when the Thirty-seventh Congress came together again in its regular session in December, 1861, and an attempt was made to reaffirm the Crittenden resolution which had received such universal approval but a few months before, it was decisively rejected. It was rejected by a party vote upon the motion of Stevens, who had thus considerable satisfaction in seeing that at least his own party had now come to his position in asserting its freedom from a doctrinaire impediment to the conduct of the war, and that the nation was now to feel free to strike at slavery or to do whatever else would seem best calculated to promote the success of the national cause.

The events of the war had, however, made no change in the purposes and opinions of Stevens. His principles were settled, his mind was fixed from the beginning. When the Crittenden resolution had been offered in July, he objected to it and withheld his vote. He was one of four in the House who were not ready to subscribe to its doctrine. He was one of the more pronounced and radical—may we not say more far-seeing?—antislavery men who believed that the Rebellion must result in the destruction of slavery. He would not embarrass the government nor prevent its dealing a blow in opposition to slavery when occasion should arise. He wanted the government to have a free hand, an unrestricted liberty, in the conduct of the war, and he did not wish Congress to commit itself to a doctrine from which it would subsequently have to recede. He believed in the beginning what Lincoln came to believe in the midst of the war, that, in this national crisis, Congress and the President, representing the sovereign nation, had the right to take “any step which might best subdue the enemy.”¹ He wanted the rulers of the nation to indulge no scruples nor lay down any generalities that would interfere with the most vigorous prosecution of the war.

Time clearly vindicated Stevens's leadership in this respect. A fortnight had not gone by after the passage of the Crittenden resolution defining the objects of the war and giving an implied promise that slavery would not be interfered with, before slavery had become a subject of sore discussion in Congress. It came up in connection

¹ *Life and Writings of B. R. Curtis*, I. 348.

with the first Confiscation Act, August 3, 1861. To this measure Stevens gave his earnest support. This was the beginning of war legislation concerning slavery. It aroused opposition, because a section of the law required that owners should forfeit the slaves whom they allowed to be used in arms against the United States or to labor in forts or intrenchments, or whom they should employ in any naval or military capacity against the national government.

In the debate on confiscation, August 2, 1861, Stevens voiced his deep opposition to slavery and his purpose to strike at that institution whenever occasion offered. He said:¹

God forbid that I should ever agree that the slaves should be returned to their masters and that you should rivet again the chains which you have once broken. I do not say that this war is made for that purpose. Ask those who made the war what its object is. Do not ask us. I did not like the Crittenden resolution because it looked like an apology from us in saying what were the objects of the war. Those who made the war should explain its objects. Our object is to subdue the rebels.

In this discussion Stevens predicted the arming of the blacks and said that he was ready to act for it, "horrifying to gentlemen as it may appear; that is my doctrine and it will be the doctrine of the whole people of the North before two years roll round."

After the rejection of the Crittenden resolution in December, 1861, Stevens wished to bring his party and the administration to higher and more aggressive ground upon slavery and emancipation. He would speak out the whole truth whether the nation would hear or forbear. On December 3, 1861, the first day of the regular session of the Thirty-seventh Congress, Stevens introduced a joint resolution, for enactment into law, containing two propositions: the first was to strike for general emancipation as the best means of crushing the Rebellion; the second, to make full payment for losses to loyal owners by this policy. His resolution asserted that slavery had caused the Rebellion and that there could be no peace and Union while that institution existed; as slaves are used by the rebels for supporting the war, and as by the law of nations it is right to liberate the slaves of an enemy to weaken his power, therefore the President should be directed to declare free and to direct our generals in command to order freedom to all slaves who shall leave their masters or aid in quelling the Rebellion.

His speech of January 22, 1862, on these resolutions shows him

¹ In order to avoid excessive length of quotation, I have throughout this article omitted many sentences from Stevens's speeches without sign of omission and have even in some cases used abridged phrases, without, I trust, ever misrepresenting in any degree his meaning.

to be one of the earliest, boldest, most outspoken, and, I think, most influential of the antislavery advocates who were seeking to direct the war to antislavery ends. Stevens knew that Congress and his party were not yet ready to follow in the line of his proposals, and that the public sentiment of the country did not sustain his radical policy. But he wished to educate that sentiment and to lead his party in the direction which he clearly saw would ultimately be found to be essential. He felt that the national government in the conduct of the war so far had been weak, timid, vacillating, ineffective, without appreciation of the formidable task before it. The country needed a tonic; the administration needed nerve and a stiffened spine. Stevens would infuse more energy into the prosecution of the war, and not be afraid to employ the means at hand. He did not think it a time for honeyed words and conciliation. He was not a representative of peace and good will; he was a representative for war; the business of war was to conquer, and in the war now forced upon the nation he stood for firm, unyielding, uncompromising force. It seems reasonable to say that in energizing the war power of the nation and leading it to lay hold of every possible weapon for overcoming resistance to the national authority there was in the national forum no stronger personal force than Thaddeus Stevens. A review of his speeches will give one a high appreciation of their educational influence in this direction.

He was bitter and unsparing in his denunciation of the Southern leaders for their course, and he sought to arouse the resentment and war spirit of the nation to crush the South. Yet he manifested a better conception of the Southern spirit and character and of the consequent nature of the task before the country than that possessed by his opponents and critics. Dismissing all hope of reunion by voluntary concession from the South, he wished to have it clearly recognized, as it should have been, that from the Southern standpoint the separation was final, and that the Confederate States would consent to reunion only through the exhaustion of war. Stevens saw that the task could be accomplished only by the sacrifice of thousands of lives and millions of money. He recognized that the Southerners were proud, haughty, obstinate, and that their training had led them to believe that they were born to command. They had declared that they would suffer their country to become a smoking ruin before they would submit. Stevens would accept the issue. He said:

It were better to lay waste the whole South than to suffer the nation to be murdered, better to depopulate the country and plant it with a new race of freemen, than to suffer rebellion to triumph. There should

be no negotiation, no parley, no truce until every rebel shall have laid down his arms and submitted to the Government.

He was among the first to see that this would not be done until the South was wholly exhausted:

Let us not be deceived. Those who talk about peace in sixty days are shallow statesmen. The war will not end until the Government shall more fully recognise the magnitude of the crisis; until they have discovered that this is an internecine war in which one party or the other must be reduced to hopeless feebleness and the power of further effort shall be utterly annihilated. It is a sad but true alternative. The South can never be reduced to that condition so long as the war is prosecuted on its present principles. The North with all its millions of people and its countless wealth can never conquer the South until a new mode of warfare is adopted. So long as these states are left the means of cultivating their fields through forced labor, you may expend the blood of thousands and billions of money, year by year, without being any nearer the end, unless you reach it by your own submission and the ruin of the nation. Slavery gives the South a great advantage in time of war. They need not and do not withdraw a single hand from the cultivation of the soil. Every able bodied white man can be spared for the army. The black man, without lifting a weapon is the mainstay of the war.¹

Stevens would have no regard for the "sympathizer with treason" who would "raise an outcry about a servile insurrection or prate learnedly about the Constitution." He thought a "rebellion of slaves fighting for their freedom was not so abhorrent as a rebellion of freemen fighting to murder the nation." He wished the Northern armies to be "possessed and impelled by the inspiration that comes from the glorious principle of freedom." He thought the North had not shown "the fiery zeal that impelled the South; nothing of that determined and invincible courage that was inspired in the Revolution by the grand idea of liberty, equality and rights of man."

Our statesmen do not seem to know how to touch the hearts of freemen and rouse them to battle. No sound of universal liberty has gone forth from the capital. Our generals have a sword in one hand and shackles in the other. Let it be known that this government is fighting to carry out the great principles of the Declaration of Independence and the blood of every freeman would boil with enthusiasm and his nerves be strengthened for a holy warfare. Give him the sword in one hand and the book of freedom in the other, and he will soon sweep despotism and rebellion from every corner of this continent. The occasion is forced upon us and the invitation presented to strike the chains from four millions of human beings and create them men; to extinguish slavery on this whole continent; to wipe out so far as we are concerned the most hateful and infernal blot that ever disgraced the escutcheon of man; to write a page in the history of the world whose brightness shall eclipse all the records of heroes and sages.²

¹ *Congressional Globe*, January 22, 1862.

² *Ibid.*

This was effective oratory, the oratory of conviction and action. It was spoken at a time when slavery still seemed rooted and grounded in the policy of the President and of Congress and in the public sentiment of the country. Who will say that the voice of Stevens was not a powerful influence in bringing the country and its rulers to the higher plane of emancipation, to a readiness to direct the war for liberty as well as for union?

As the war continued and the administration still seemed conservative and reluctant to pursue an antislavery policy, Stevens repeatedly expressed his dissatisfaction. Lincoln's message proposing compensated emancipation Stevens characterized as "the most diluted milk and water gruel proposition that was ever given to the American nation." He urged the passage of the Act (March 13, 1862) forbidding the return of fugitive slaves and he favored every act looking toward antislavery ends. He said he could not approve putting generals who sympathized with slavery at the head of our armies with orders to pursue and return fugitive slaves, nor did he like it to have our forces set to guard the property of rebel soldiers. When asked if he intended his charge against the President and the Secretary of War or only against the generals in the field, he said "I intend it shall apply where it belongs."

I am no sycophant, no parasite. What I think I say. These acts have been perpetrated without rebuke. Let the world determine where the responsibility rests. I believe the President is as honest a man as there is in the world; but I believe him to be too easy and amiable, and to be misled by the malign influence of Kentucky counselors—and the Border State men.¹

He again urged the enlistment of negro troops and advised the administration not to be afraid of the cry of abolitionism, but to follow out the policy of military emancipation suggested by General Hunter's order. He had no hope of success until that policy was adopted. He viewed the matter not only as a question of emancipation or abolition, but as the only means of putting down the Rebellion. For rebuking General Hunter he thought the administration deserved to be driven out, and he denounced it for refusing the liberation and employment of the slaves. He would seize all property of disloyal men as our armies advanced, and he would plant the South with a military colony if the Southerners would not otherwise submit.

We come now to the attitude of Stevens toward the Constitution; the constitutionality of war measures; and the effect of secession and war on the status of the seceded states.

The antislavery policy advocated by Stevens and men like him

¹ *Congressional Globe*, July 5, 1862.

was one of the apologies for party opposition to the war. The anti-slavery men were accused of wishing to make the war entirely subservient to abolition, and of being unwilling to see the Union restored with slavery as it was. They would not be quiet but were obtruding their opinions everywhere, with the result that while in July, 1861, the nation was united, the Union forces were now divided, since those who wished to prosecute the war solely for the purpose of restoring the Union were alienated and estranged.¹ A large body of conservative men in the North, chiefly among those who had opposed the Republican party and Mr. Lincoln's election, looked upon the antislavery programme both as a perversion of the Constitution and as an entire departure from the original and legitimate objects of the war. Under the leadership of adroit and able men, these conservative Democrats and Constitutional Unionists became a compact party of opposition whose opinions and purposes may be summarized as follows:

(1) In the first place they accepted the Crittenden resolution as their war platform, and they would have it clearly recognized that the primary and sole object of the war was to save the Union. It was not to interfere in any way with slavery. Any act or policy tending to turn the military forces of the government from mere union-saving to abolitionism, or toward emancipation as a means of union-saving, was unconstitutional, a perversion of the object of the war, and it ought to be resisted.

(2) In the second place the war must be so conducted and ended as to preserve the equality of the states. The Union was based on this equality and it must be preserved. There must be no conquest or subjugation or interference with statehood or with the rights of the states, their governments, or their domestic laws. Whoever should attempt by Federal authority to destroy any of the states, or to establish territorial governments within them, was guilty of a high crime against the Constitution and the Union. The Union as it was must be restored and maintained under the Constitution as it is; and any person proposing peace on any other basis than the integrity of the states was as guilty a criminal as he who would propose peace on the basis of a dismembered Union. The Southern states must not be reduced to provinces or territories, nor the Southern people regarded as alien enemies; but the constitutional relation of the states to the Union was to be recognized as being undisturbed and the constitutional rights of the Southern people should be fully maintained. To prosecute hostilities beyond these limits or in a spirit of

¹ *Diven of New York, Congressional Globe, January 22, 1862.*

conquest would destroy state equality, subvert the Constitution, and prevent the Union.¹

(3) In the third place, a corollary to this view, the constitutional limits set to congressional and executive power must be the same in war as in peace. Secession, rebellion, and war had made no change as to the power that Congress could exercise within the states, be they the states of the Confederacy or the states of the Union. The President's powers were not increased. Therefore his executive orders, his proclamations, his military emancipation, his suspension of *habeas corpus*, his arbitrary arrests, must all be tested by the terms and canons of the Constitution as in times of peace. "The Union as it was; the Constitution as it is," was the maxim of the party.

In the view of these constitutionalists, the Union was to be saved only by, through, and under the Constitution—nothing more nor less. They idealized the Constitution. To them the Constitution was identical with the nation. Without it there could be no Union. The Constitution gone, the republic is dead. The war was for the preservation of the Constitution and for that alone; it was against the Constitution and because it was binding on all that the Southerners were rebels. These conservatives denounced the antislavery advocates as being indifferent as to whether or not their policies were in harmony with the Constitution, and this fact made the hated abolitionists—as they called all antislavery men—as guilty criminals as the secessionists themselves.

In the view of this party almost everything that the President or Congress proposed or did, for the effective and vigorous prosecution of the war, was unconstitutional. Confiscation of slave property was unconstitutional; retaining fugitive slaves within our lines was unconstitutional; the military emancipation of Fremont and Hunter was unconstitutional; the use of slaves as contraband was unconstitutional; Lincoln's plan of compensated emancipation was unconstitutional; enlistment of negro troops was unconstitutional; the Emancipation Proclamation was unconstitutional; the draft was unconstitutional; the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* was unconstitutional; military arrests were unconstitutional; suspending or in any way reinstituting state governments at the South was unconstitutional; Lincoln's appointment of military governors and his beginnings of reconstruction were unconstitutional. No exercise of power was constitutional except what was unmistakably granted by a strict construction of the Constitution interpreted as in times of peace. Instead of the war's having made all the difference in the

¹ Pendleton's resolutions, *Congressional Globe*, July 31, 1861.

world, it had made no difference at all. The Southern states and the Southern people were to have all the rights, privileges, immunities, and benefits of the Constitution. They were not bound by its provisions in the conduct of the war, but their opponents were to be restrained from every aggressive act of power not within its specific limits. This was a fearful handicap for the national government. Such a policy would have led to a passive and harmless war—almost purely defensive in its operations. Carried to its logical conclusion, no invasion of the Southern states nor subduing of the Southern people would have been possible under it, and it is very problematical whether the Constitution and the Union could have been saved for the South under its operation.

To this party and its constitutional view Thaddens Stevens was diametrically opposed. He was its constant and stout antagonist. He derided these sticklers for the Constitution and in unsparing terms he denounced all their works and ways. They and he were at the antipodes of the political world, and they had but little bowels of mercy for one another. Stevens wished to establish a legal basis for the conduct of the war that would give the nation a chance to fight, and in the first discussion on slavery and the war to which I have referred (August 2, 1861) he laid down the legal and proper premises for that fight. He brushed theories aside, looked at the facts, and saw things as they were, and he sought a basis of action best calculated to bring the result desired. He took the bold ground that in the contest for its life the nation was not bound by the limitations of the Constitution. The war had abrogated the Constitution—not where it was respected and could be enforced by ordinary civil processes, but with respect to hostile confederated states that had rejected and repudiated the Constitution, trampled it under foot, and were resisting its restoration by organized armies. The people of the Confederate States were public belligerent enemies, and the nation in its effort to overcome them was bound only by the laws of war and the law of nations. The Constitution had no right to intervene if it stood in the way of the laws of war in dealing with the enemy.

Who says the Constitution must come in in bar of our action? It is the advocates of rebels, of rebels who have repudiated the Constitution, who have sought to overthrow it and trample it in the dust. Sir, these rebels who have disregarded and set at defiance that instrument are, by every rule of municipal and international law, estopped from pleading it against our action. Sir, it is an absurdity. There must be a party in court to plead it, and that party to be entitled to plead it in court, must first acknowledge its supremacy, or he has no business

to be in court at all. . . . They can not be permitted to come in here and tell us that we must be loyal to the Constitution.¹

When he was asked how members of Congress who had taken an oath to support the Constitution could violate it in their action, whether rebels complain of it or not, he replied that they do not violate it when they are operating against men who have no rights to the benefits of the Constitution. The law of nations was plain upon this point, the law established in the days of Cicero, "*Inter arma silent leges.*" "This is a law that has been in force to the present time, and any nation that disregards the law is a poor pusillanimous nation which submits its neck to be struck off by the enemy."

Stevens admitted that the Constitution, while it was in force for the South, did not authorize Congress to interfere with slavery in the states. While the Constitution and laws were supreme no one would attempt it. But when the Constitution had been repudiated and set at defiance by armed rebellion the case was different.

There were not [he said] three thousand abolitionists, properly so called in the United States. Before this war the parties were bound together by a compact, by a treaty, called a Constitution. They admitted the validity of municipal laws binding on each. This war has cut asunder all these ligaments, abrogated all these obligations. Since these States have voluntarily thrown off that protection and placed themselves under the law of nations, it is not only our right but our duty to knock off every shackle from every limb.

He who wishes to re-establish the Union as it was cannot escape the guilt of attempting to enslave his fellow-men. The "Union as it was and the Constitution as it is", is an atrocious idea; it is man-stealing. The Southern States have forfeited all rights under the Constitution which they have renounced. They are forever estopped from claiming the Constitution as it was. The United States may give them those rights if it choose, but *they cannot claim them*. If a disgraceful peace were made leaving the cause of this rebellion and the cause of future wars untouched and living, its authors would be the objects of the deepest execration and of the blackest infamy. . . . All this clamor against radicals, all this cry of the "Union as it was", is but a persistent effort to re-establish slavery and to rivet anew forever the chains of bondage on the limbs of immortal beings. May the God of Justice thwart their designs and paralyze their wicked efforts.²

Stevens believed that in an emergency in order to "snatch the nation from the jaws of death" Congress was authorized to declare a dictator. It was a fearful power, and he hoped the necessity for it would never arise. But the safety of the people is the supreme

¹ *Congressional Globe*, August 2, 1861. .

² *Ibid.*, January 22, 1864.

law, and rather than see the nation perish, rather than see it dishonored by compromise, concession, and submission, rather than see the Union dissevered, he was ready to apply the dictator's power.

It will be seen that Stevens's constitutional position, or extra-constitutional position, was consistent, straightforward, and outspoken. He blinked nothing, but always looked the constitutional issue squarely in the face. He made no pretenses and would resort to no forced construction to justify a course already predetermined. This is seen still more clearly in his attitude toward the admission of West Virginia.

The Constitution clearly provides that no state shall be divided except by its own consent. When Virginia seceded, the people in the western counties of the state, wishing to remain loyal to the Union, assumed to form a state government and choose state officers and a state legislature. They elected Senators and Representatives to Congress, who were admitted to their seats. They claimed to be the people of Virginia, constitutionally competent to give its consent to the formation of a new state within the borders of the Old Dominion. This people, having given its consent to the division of the old state of Virginia, immediately erected itself into the new state of West Virginia. Nobody consented except those within the limits of the new state. That is, the new state consented to the division of the old. And when the new state had been admitted according to prearrangement, Mr. Pierpont, pretending to be the governor of the state that pretended to be Virginia, was to move over to Alexandria and keep up the pretense of being the gubernatorial head of Old Virginia, with an official body that Sumner afterward called the "common council of Alexandria." As Stevens said after the war, "all the archives, property, and effects of the Pierpont Government were taken to Richmond in an ambulance." This was the government recognized during the war as the legitimate constitutional government of Virginia.

There were distinguished members of Congress who sought to find ground in the Constitution, or in the fictitious construction of that instrument, for this process by which Virginia was divided and West Virginia admitted. It was not the way of Thaddeus Stevens. To Stevens the proceedings, or the arguments based upon them, were all ridiculous and absurd. He was opposed to giving seats in the House to members from Virginia after the secession of that state, for "We know," as he said, "that members have been elected to this House by only twenty votes and those

cast under the guns of a fort. Now, to say that those gentlemen represent any district is a mere mockery."¹

Stevens was willing to accomplish the end in view, the dismemberment of Virginia and the admission of the new state, the sufficient ground for the act being that it would weaken the enemy and help the national cause. But he recognized that the legal ground for the proceeding was, not the Constitution, but the laws of war. "We may admit West Virginia," he said, "not by any provisions of the Constitution but under our absolute power which the laws of war give us. I shall vote for this bill upon that theory and that alone; for I will not stultify myself by supposing that we have any warrant in the Constitution for this proceeding."

He regarded it as mockery to claim that the legislature of Virginia had ever consented to the division of that state. The majority of the people of Virginia, organized as a political community, was the state of Virginia. That state had changed its constitution and its relation to the federal government from that of one of its members to that of secession. The act was treason, but so far as the state corporation was concerned it was a valid act and governed the state. "A small number of the citizens of Virginia—the people in West Virginia—sembled together, disapproved of the acts of Virginia and with the utmost self-complacency called themselves Virginia. Is it not ridiculous?"

That seems more straightforward than to stretch the Constitution by a forced and fictitious construction while claiming to respect its provisions. To a layman it seems like better law, sounder sense, and more correct political science, if the United States was to be regarded as a nation and not a mere congeries of states.

This view of the character of the state and the effect of secession he maintained consistently on all occasions. He looked upon the Southern states as public enemies. We were at war with an acknowledged belligerent, with a foreign nation, and since such a war had annulled all former compacts existing between them neither could claim as against the other the aid of the Constitution. Stevens held that the Southern states, having committed treason, renounced their allegiance to the Union, discarded its Constitution and laws, organized a distinct and hostile government, and by force of arms having risen from the condition of insurgents to the position of an independent power *de facto*, and having been acknowledged as a belligerent both by foreign nations and by our own government, the Constitution and laws of the Union were set aside as far as they were concerned, and that as between the two belligerents they were under

¹ *Congressional Globe*, December 2, 1861.

the laws of war and nations alone. If the rebel states were still in the Union and under the Constitution, as some contended, he saw no reason why they should not elect the next President of the United States. If the rebels declined to vote, then one hundred loyal men who, as his legal opponents contended, still continued to be "the state," might meet and choose electors. The few loyal men around Fortress Monroe or Norfolk, or Alexandria, and a few cleansed patches in Louisiana, being one thousandth part of the state, might choose electors for the whole state. It was such reasoning that seemed like a mockery of constitutional law and political science to Stevens.

As to the minority who were loyal to the Union within a seceded state, he would regard them as citizens of that state and subject to its conditions. They must migrate or bear the burdens and penalties of their domicile, although in dealing with persons he would distinguish between the innocent and the guilty. The states were at war with the nation. The idea that a few loyal citizens are the state and may override and govern the disloyal millions, he was unable to comprehend. "If ten men fit to save Sodom can elect a governor and other state officers against more than a million Sodomites in Virginia, then the democratic doctrine that the majority shall rule is discarded and ignored."

The position of Stevens was vigorously assailed by Mr. Francis P. Blair, of Missouri, in a notable speech in the House, February 5, 1864. Blair held that Stevens's policy of confiscation could only be effected by the extermination of our whole kindred race in the South. The world would expect them to shed the last drop of blood rather than to submit to such spoliation, with no alternative but to die as paupers. Europe would be justified in intervening to put down such an innovation on the code of humanity and to arrest barbarities in defiance of the law of nations. It was frenzied altruism tending to promote "amalgamation of repugnant races in the name and by the charm of equality."

Blair held that the Southern states were indestructible; that their status was like that of Missouri, whose state organization had remained loyal to the Union. All that was needed was to drive out the rebel power that was holding the state government in duress. Our army and navy were crushing the life out of the usurpation, vetoing what Blair called the "assumption of Stevens that the state governments in the rebel states are as perfect now as before the rebellion, and being subsisting states, capable of corporate action, they have as states changed their allegiance from the United States to the Confederate States." In this undeniable fact, as Stevens had

stated it, Blair maintained that the secession doctrine was "absolutely recognized, with more distinctness than Calhoun ventured to urge it."

Here the majority of disloyalists in a State [said Blair] have the right admitted to over-ride a minority of loyal men and make them forswear their allegiance to the Union. No man, North or South, ever asserted the secession cause so boldly in the forum as the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He founds the rebel government upon the will of a majority of the people; proclaims that the minority, though loyal to the General Government (which has a right to the allegiance of all) must abandon the states or subscribe to their authority; insists that the usurpation has established independent states endowed with all the immunities and rights of an independent nation carrying on a legitimate war. This is the secession, abolition, absolute-conquest doctrine which the gentleman has broached in defiance of national and State Constitutions, the law of the civilized world and of all humanity.¹

On May 2, 1864, during the discussion in the House on the Wade-Davis plan of reconstruction, Stevens had occasion to refer to these criticisms. He restated his position that the South was only a belligerent, with such rights only as the laws of war might accord. The fact of their being rebels as well as belligerents put them in a worse predicament and only extended our rights and justified the *summum jus* of martial law. In urging again a general scheme of confiscation he said the country should decide whether this was an unjust war, and whether the enemy was obstinate and ought to bear the burden of the war.

Stevens pictured in vigorous language the suffering and destruction of the war, which he denounced as unjust and as deserving of punishment. "If we are not justified", he said, "in exacting the extreme demands of war then I can hardly conceive a case where it would be applicable. To allow them to return with their estates untouched, on the theory that they have never gone out of the Union, seems to me rank injustice to loyal men."

Stevens replied with special vigor to Blair, "whose speech", he said, "contained the distilled virus of the copperhead." He recognized that selling estates in perpetuity as the result of attainder for treason was forbidden by the Constitution; conviction for treason could work no such consequence. What he contended for was the forfeiture of the property of rebels as enemies. Blair had said that Stevens had "treated with scorn the idea that States held in duress by the rebel power have a right to look to our laws and Constitution for protection." Stevens replied:

This is a false statement of my position. If the armies of the Confederate States should overrun a loyal state and hold it in duress,

¹ *Congressional Globe*, February 5, 1864.

that state would have a right to appeal to the Constitution for protection. But a state which by a free majority of its voters has thrown off its allegiance to the Constitution and holds itself in duress by its own armies, is estopped from claiming any protection under the Constitution. To say that such a state is within the pale of the Union so as to claim protection under its Constitution and laws is but the raving of a madman.

To escape the consequence of my argument he [Blair] denies that the Confederate States have been acknowledged as a belligerent or have established and maintained independent governments *de facto*. Such assurance would deny that there was a sun in the heavens. They have a Congress in which eleven states are represented; they have at least 300,000 soldiers in the field; their pickets are almost within sight of Washington. They have ships of war on the ocean destroying hundreds of our ships, and our government and the governments of Europe acknowledge and treat them as privateers, not as pirates. There is no reasoning against such impudent denials.

Stevens denied that he was countenancing secession in recognizing the palpable facts of war. The law forbids robbery and murder, but these crimes exist *de facto*. Does the man who declares their existence give countenance to them? If the fiction of equity courts that whatever ought to be shall be considered as existing—if this is true, then the rebel states are in the Union.

If the naked facts, palpable to every eye, attested by many bloody battle-fields, and recorded by every day's hostile legislation both in Washington and Richmond are to prevail, then the rebellious states are no more in the Union *in fact*, than the loyal states are in the Confederate States. Nor should they ever be treated so until they repent and are rebaptized into the National Union.

Stevens congratulated the country that the House had recently passed a resolution (1864) recognizing the Confederate States as a public enemy. That was the doctrine for which he had been contending. The consequences which he had sought to establish would follow as a corollary. "I have lived", he said, "to see the triumph of principles which, although I had full faith in their ultimate success, I did not expect to witness. If Providence will spare me a little longer, until this government shall be so reconstructed that the foot of a slave can never again tread upon the soil of the Republic, I shall be content to accept any lot which may await me."¹

These extracts will serve to make clear Stevens's attitude toward the chief issues of the Civil War. Those whom he opposed will not be easily reconciled to honor his memory. As Sumner said, "No one gave to language a sharper bite." His words were words of sarcasm, satire, denunciation. They aroused resentment and often left a bitter sting. His antagonists dreaded him, and he has been

¹ *Congressional Globe*, vol. 65, pp. 2042-2043, May 2, 1864.

spoken of as a man of hate and vindictive vengeance. But there is testimony to show, from party friend and foe alike, that he was a man of deep and tender humanitarian feelings. He desired fair play and a square deal for all mankind. The punitive measures which he favored did not spring from personal feelings. It was the cause that he hated or loved. He loved justice; he entertained a deep hatred of slavery and secession, and he believed that a just punishment, as well as mercy, should be visited upon those whom he considered as the guilty authors of his country's woes. In this he was but human, a natural man begotten of passionate times, and he probably represented to a large degree the feelings of a majority of his fellow-countrymen. He deplored the compromising errors of the fathers, and his great purpose was to write the law of justice and human equality into the Constitution of his country; and he would feign no fraternal, sentimental regard for those who, as he thought, sought to violate, obstruct, or pervert these great principles of government.

JAMES ALBERT WOODBURN.

DOCUMENTS

1. *The Catholic Mission in Maryland, 1641.*

THE two documents which follow were discovered among the Barberini MSS. in the Vatican Library by Dr. Arnold O. Meyer of the Prussian Historical Institute in Rome, and by him communicated to the REVIEW. The designation of their place is: Cod. Barberini lat. 8690, "Colonia e Inghilterra, Carlo Rossetti 1641, II. 107, 37", foll. 173-175. The writer of the letter, Mgr. Carlo Rossetti, titular archbishop of Sardis and later of Tarsus, was at the time of its writing pontifical representative in London, and as such figures largely in the contemporary history of Catholicism in England. Not many days after the date of the letter, on September 27, he was made extraordinary nuncio at Cologne. The letter was apparently addressed to either Cardinal Francesco or Cardinal Antonio Barberini, who were nephews of the reigning pope, Urban VIII., and who in a sense occupied jointly a position analogous to that of cardinal secretary of state. The "relation" which is enclosed with the letter exists also, it appears, in other copies. One, perhaps to be regarded as the original and differing slightly from this, is in the Vatican Archives, "Nunziatura d'Inghilterra", and it is understood that a paragraph from it is to be printed (under the number 19 D) in Father Thomas Hughes's forthcoming *History of the Jesuits in North America*. Another is in the Archives of the Propaganda. Much of the same information as is presented in this relation is also to be found in the extracts from the Annual Letters which accompany the *Relatio Itinèris in Marylandiam* published by the Maryland Historical Society.

I.

[fol. 173r] 7 sett. 41

*Eminentissimo e Rmo. Do. pr̄on Colmo:*¹

Il libro d'Henrici Spilmani de non temerandis ecclesiis² Lundini in 8°. di cui già hebbi comandamento da V. E. s'è finalmente trovato, e la settimana seguente penso poterlo havere per inviarlo all' E. V. Qui congiunta le mando una relatione dell'Isola di Mariland, haven-

¹ I. e., Eminentissimo e Reverendissimo Domino Patrono Colendissimo.

² Sir Henry Spelman, *De non Temerandis Ecclesiis: a Tracte of the Rights and Respect due unto Churches* (London, 1613, and other editions).

done procurato la notitia da Londra da persone indifferenti, e ben'informate di quelle parti d'Inghilterra. S'intende ancora che quei P. P. Cappuccini habbiano havuto qualche fastidio, e che l'Ambasciatore del Re xp̄mo insistesse grandemente per la loro sodisfattione, e dicono che la Città sia piena di dolianze, e di mormorazioni [fol. 173v.] contro il parlamento, perch' in tanto tempo non habbia pigliato provvedimento a i bisogni del Regno. Et io in tanto resto facendo all' E. V. profundissima riverenza.

D. V. E. Rma¹

humiliss^{mo}: divotiss^{mo}. Servo oblig^{mo}:

CARLO ROSSETTI.

GANTE 7 7mbre 1641

II.

[fol. 174r.] Quae regio modo Marilandia vulgo nuncupatur, ea pars est peninsulae, quae ad oram Americae inter Oceanum ad Orientem, et inter Sinum Cheasapeak ad Occidentem, paulo ultra Virginiam iacet.

Haec per Anglos primum inventa, neque per Principem aliud [sic] Christianum aut alicuius Ministros occupata, cum adiacentibus insulis intra limites praedictos constitutis, et iis etiam, quae posthac reperientur in Oceanum ad decem Leucas orientem versus Dño Cecilio Calvert Baroni Baltamor in remunerationem obsequii a parente Regi Iacobo cui a Secretis erat, fideliter praestiti, in haereditatem perpetuam cum iure absoluti proprietarii a Ser^{mo}. Rege Angliae Carolo, salvo tamen supremo dominio et fidelitate Regiae suae M^u. debita per magnam Chartam ante annos novem data concessa et confirmata est.

Itaque sub finem anni 1633 Dominus Leonardus Calvert primam eo Coloniam deduxit et totius regionis pro fratre Gubernator constitutus est. Cum eo missi sunt Barone rogante duo ex Societate Jesu sacerdotes cum uno coadiutore temporalis [temporalis] quibus annis subsequenter accesserunt alii quattuor sacerdotes ex eadem Societate cum altero coadiutore temporalis [temporalis]. [fol. 174v.] Sed Sacerdotibus duobus cum utroque laico morte sublati, nam tertius in Angliam rediit, tres iam dumtaxat sacerdotes ibidem supersunt, nec praeter eos alios [alios] ullus Sacerdos, sive saecularis sive regularis vixisse in Colonia hactenus notum est.²

¹ I. e., Di Vostra Eminenza Reverendissima.

² Fathers Andrew White and John Altham *alias* Gravener came out with the first settlers. Five other Jesuit priests had since come to the province: Fathers Philip Fisher *alias* Thomas Copley, John Knowles, Ferdinand Poulton, John Brock *alias* Morgan, and Roger Rigby. Of these Fathers Knowles, Poulton, Altham, and Brock had died, the latter on June 5 of this same year, 1641. The three priests remaining were Fathers White, Fisher, and Rigby. The two lay coadjutors, who had died, were Thomas Gervase and Walter Morley. (Information kindly furnished by Rev. Professor Edward I. Devitt, S.J., of Georgetown University.)

Colonia porro universa nondum quadringentas personas¹ numerat inter quas centum circiter Catholicam fidem profitentur, reliquae ad heterodoxos spectant; e quibus paulo amplius quam quadraginta ab erroribus quos inhiberant rescipiscentes [resipiscentes], ad Catholicae Ecclesiae gremium reductae sunt.²

Barbari regionis incolae a Colonia remotius habitant. Litterarum omnium rudes, idiomate utuntur proprio, sed ob dialectorum varietatem ad discendum perdifficili, quo evangelii praedicatio vel maxime impeditur. Profectum tamen aliquod usque est, et magno labore confectus Cathéchismus.³

Gens si quae alia inops plane est, et misera. Impuberes nudi penitus, estate vero magis adulti viri coque [?] ac foeminae puellae aliqua ad modestiam ex parte contacti incedunt. Ex venatione victum quotidianum quacurrunt ideoque vix stabili loco consistunt. Non carent quidem vitiis nec vitiorum [fol. 175r.] occasionibus, paucioribus tamen quam alii solent Barbari laborant. Ad mansuetudinem videntur propendere, passionesque et motus animi mire moderati. Ubi nullum intervenit periculum vitae, iniuriam et contemptus egregie patiuntur.

Nulla inter eos Idola, quibus singularem aliquem cultum ac venerationem impertiant, neque ulli sacrificuli: sunt tamen qui superstitiosius quaedam colunt, sed deridentur ab iis, qui prudentiores vulgo habentur. Obscuram aliquam notitiam Dei agnoscere videntur, sed quo eum modo venerari debeant prorsus nesciunt. De immortalitate animae atque alterius vitae statu nihil intelligunt.

Sunt inter eos qui insigni aliquo a reliquis secernuntur et Imperatorum Regumque loco habentur, quibus supremum ius competit. Unicuique Regi unum fere oppidum cum terris adiacentibus, Imperatori plura oppida Regesque subduntur.

Inter hos Cathéchismo, et Christianae fidei rudimentis prius sufficienter instructi 5^a. [die 5^a.?] Iulii superioris anni 1640, Sacro baptismo solemniter initiati sunt, Imperator Pascatoa,⁴ cum Coniuge, et filia nec dum ablactata (quae paulo post feliciter mortua est) et praecipuus Consiliarius cum filio; filiam alteram septennem in Coloniam prius miserat Imperator ab Anglia [Anglica] Matrona nobili educandam, instruendamque, quae etiam deinde Deo volente baptizabitur. [fol. 175v.] Praeter hos pauci quoque alii intra septennium, ut dabatur occasio, baptismum susceperunt. Quae recenter perferuntur litterae, Imperatorem extremum diem Christianae [sic] obiisse, et complures ad proximum solemne baptismum se parare nunciant; inter quos unus est Rex Arostanorum [Anacostanorum].

¹ An assessment on the freemen, of September 13, 1641, designates one hundred and forty-six persons to be taxed. Johnson, *Foundations of Maryland*, p. 167.

² See *Relatio Itineris in Marylandiam*, pp. 56-60.

³ The catechism was found by Father William McSherry in the archives of the Society of Jesus. *Ibid.*, 118.

⁴ Pascataway. The ceremony is more fully described in *Relatio Itineris*, p. 74.

Equidem ad praedicandum evangelium, amplificandamque Ecclesiam per infidelium potissimum conversionem, ostium magnum apertum iam est, quod obstruere conantur ii, qui e Societate Mercatoria Virginiae¹ Baroni se opponunt, et Coloniam e manibus et potestate Catholicorum eripere magno molimine conituntur, sed nullo hactenus alio effectu quam quod per exactionem Iuramenti vulgo fidelitatis nuncupati protectionem Catholicorum in eam difficillimam reddidere, quasi Regi et Statui Angliae periculosam. In Comitibus vero quid impetraturi sint nondum certo constat.

Atque hic est tam huius Coloniae, quam Missionis praesens status.

2. *Edmund Randolph on the British Treaty, 1795.*

OF the following documents, sent to the REVIEW by Mr. Worthington C. Ford, the first three are in the Library of Congress, Division of Manuscripts. All are in Randolph's handwriting. The fourth and most important, Randolph's letter to the President on the question of ratification, is no longer to be found among the Washington papers in that library, but may be seen only in the form of a copy in a volume of transcripts made for Washington of letters addressed to him by the secretaries of state. For this reason, and also because it is out of its chronological place in that volume of transcripts, it might escape the attention of students.

It may be useful to remind the reader that the Jay treaty, signed November 19, 1794, was received by the President March 7, 1795; that the Senate was convened for June 8, agreed on June 24 to ratify conditionally, and adjourned June 26; that, Randolph alone of the cabinet opposing, the President signed the ratification on August 18; and that Randolph's dramatic resignation occurred on the next day, August 19.

RANDOLPH TO THE PRESIDENT.²

E. Randolph has the honor of suggesting to the President, whether it may not be expedient to take the opinion of the gentlemen *in writing* on the following points: 1. Is not the resolution of the Senate, respecting the treaty between the U. S. and G. Britain, intended to be their final act; or do they expect, that the new article shall be submitted to them, before the treaty takes effect? 2. Does the constitution permit

¹ Perhaps the allusion is to Cloberry and Company, perhaps more generally to those who had had part in the management of the Virginia Company in its last years.

² The original of this note is in the Library of Congress, Letters to Washington, Miscellaneous, 117, p. 272. The President's letter of June 29, asking of the members of the cabinet substantially the questions here suggested, is in Sparks, *Washington*, XI. 31, and Ford, XIII. 59.

the President to ratify the treaty, without submitting the new article, after it shall be agreed to by the British king, to the advice and consent of the Senate?¹

Upon these points E. R. has satisfied himself.² But he knows, that it is contemplated to embarrass the treaty, by objecting to the course, which may be observed in its ratification; and therefore is anxious, that the President be supported in his measures upon it, by the best advice, which is at hand.

Mr. Adet has proposed a conference with E. R. tomorrow morning. The hour proposed is 9 o'clock. Whatever has been lying in his breast, will no doubt then appear.

June 25, 1795.

MEMORANDUM OF FACTS TO BE RECORDED.³

On the 8th of June 1795, Mr. Fauchet wrote to me, among other things, requesting that I would communicate to the President of the U. S. how desirable it would be, that the final vote of the Senate on the treaty with Great Britain should be suspended, until his successor, Mr. Adet, should arrive, and have time to impart his instructions, relative thereto, which he doubtless had. I did communicate Mr. Fauchet's letter to the President, on the same 8th of June; and it did not seem advisable to take any measures upon that subject then. On Saturday the 13th of June in the evening Mr. Adet arrived and took lodgings in Philadelphia. On Monday, the 15th of June, at 11 o'clock in the morning, Mr. Fauchet accompanied him to my house, and introduced him to me; when he delivered to me a copy of his letters of credence. These were that day shewn to the President, who, having approved them, authorized me to inform Mr. Adet, that he would be received next day at 2 o'clock P. M. I accordingly informed him. On the next day, the 16th of June, I returned Mr. Adet's visit; and as we were walking

¹ On the general subject of the ratification of treaties by the Senate with amendments see Senator H. C. Lodge's article, "The Treaty-Making Power of the Senate," in *Scribner's Magazine* for January, 1902, and *Senate Document* 104, 57th Congress, first session. The form followed by the Senate in this case was to give its advice and consent to ratification, "on condition that there be added to the said treaty an article, whereby it shall be agreed to suspend the operation of so much of the 12th article as respects the trade which his said Majesty thereby consents may be carried on, between the United States and his islands in the West Indies, in the manner, and on the terms and conditions therein specified. And the Senate recommend to the President to proceed without delay to further friendly negotiations with his Majesty, on the subject of the said trade, and of the terms and conditions in question." *Executive Journals*, I. 186.

² His own replies, opposing the President's sending to the Senate an article already drawn up, to be approved as a substitute for Art. XII., is in *Letters to Washington*, 117, pp. 274, 275, and in *Sparks, Washington*, XI. 477, 478.

³ The original of this memorandum is in *Letters to Washington*, Miscellaneous, 117, p. 286. Three sentences of it are printed, with omissions and some alterations, in *Conway's Edmund Randolph*, p. 249.

together in the garden at Oeller's hotel, about a quarter before two, he informed me, that he should send me the next day some act of the French government, relative to commerce. I deemed it improper to ask any explanations; as the development was to follow so soon. But I heard nothing from Mr. Adet on the next day which was Wednesday, Thursday, Friday or Saturday. On Sunday, the 21st of June, I received a packet from Mr. Adet, inclosing copies of the commissions of the consul-general, and three consuls, and requesting exequaturs. On Monday the 22d of June I visited Mr. Adet again; and in conversation I referred to some late letters, which I had sent him. He said, that he would answer such as required answers soon. I told to him [*sic*], that I had at first supposed the packet, which I had received the day before, was what he had expressed on the 16th of June his intention of sending to me the next day. He said that it was copying, and gave me reason to suppose, that he should forward it on that day, the 22d of June. Nothing was forwarded to me on that day by him. On Tuesday the 23d of June I accompanied Mr. Adet to the President's room; when a fair occasion offered, in speaking of the Senate, to inform him, that the Senate would rise on the next day, the 24th of June. I told Mr. Swann the same thing on the same day in the President's room. But I have not at this moment received from Mr. Adet any other communication of business, than what is stated above. The Senate rose about 12 o'clock yesterday.

EDM. RANDOLPH.

June 27, 1795.

MEMORANDUM.¹

1. Silence—2. positive declaration—3. qualified declaration.

1. Silence throws a doubt on Pt's [President's] intentions; the effect incidental to an unsettled state of things.

From silence, assent argued—Why not express.

P. must express to B. Govt., else delay—Why not now?

Qu: If form settled satisfactorily.

Is article necessary to be propounded?

May it not defeat immediate adjustment?

2. Positive.

Message.

The resolution of the Senate, by which "they *do* consent to, and advise the Pt. of the U. S. to ratify the treaty of amity, commerce and navigation, lately concluded between his B. M. and the U. S. of America," on the condition therein expressed, was yesterday notified to me. It is expedient, that I should inform you, in what sense I understand that resolution. It is, that, as soon as the condition shall be fulfilled, in conformity with the instructions and approbation of the President, his ratification is to take effect, and he may cause the ratification to be exchanged. [I shall therefore proceed upon this idea, unless the con-

¹ Original in Letters to Washington, Miscellaneous, 117, pp. 276, 277.

trary be stated to me; and, if the condition be agreed to, I shall ratify the said treaty.

1st alternative. I shall therefore hold myself free to act upon this idea (construction), unless the contrary be stated to me.

2d alternative. I shall therefore proceed upon this idea, unless the contrary be stated to me; and if the condition be agreed to, I shall ratify the said treaty, should no justifying cause oppose such a measure.

Qu: if necessary to say any thing about further negotiation.

Draft of an article to be added.

Whereas the President and Senate of the U. S. of America have expressed their desire that there be added to the foregoing treaty an article, suspending the operation of so much of the 12th article as respects the trade, which his majesty thereby consents may be carried on between the U. S. and his islands in the West Indies, in the manner and on the terms and conditions therein specified:

It is therefore agreed, that the operation of so much of the said article as is now recited be suspended.

Message.

The resolution of the Senate, by which "they do consent to and advise the President of the U. S. to ratify the treaty of amity, commerce and navigation, lately concluded between his B. M. and the U. S. of America," on the condition therein expressed, was yesterday notified to me. I infer from hence, that it is not the expectation of the Senate, that the treaty should be returned to them for consideration; and that as soon as the condition shall be fulfilled in conformity with the instructions and approbation of the President, he is free to cause the ratification to be exchanged. But as I am desirous, when I deliver my final judgment on the treaty, of being assured, that I have truly understood the sense of the Senate; I submit to them whether an article, which shall be in substance the same with the draught now forwarded, will fulfill the condition intended by the resolution.

RANDOLPH TO THE PRESIDENT.¹

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

July 12, 1795.

Sir,

The two questions, which I had the honor of receiving from you on the 29th ultimo, being preparatory to the measures, which appear to me most advisable to be pursued on the late treaty with Great Britain, I shall take the liberty of connecting the whole subject together.

Had the Senate advised and consented to a ratification in an unqualified manner, the President would have had nothing but the merits of the treaty, on which to decide. But as the Senate have annexed a

¹ From a copy at the Department of State, Bureau of Rolls and Library, Transcripts, XXII. 184-201.

condition, it is proper to be understood in what manner they intended that condition should be executed. That they intended their resolution of the 24 of July 1795, to be a final act; and that they do not expect the proposed article to be submitted to them before the treaty operates, is the plain signification of their words. The further negotiations, which are recommended, are not to precede, but follow the ratification; for these make no part of the condition; and the discussions in the Senate, which are recorded in the Executive Journal, shew, not only, that they were apprised of the distinction between precedent and subsequent negotiations; but that the attempts for precedent ones all failed. It was possible, that some people might hesitate upon the constitutionality of the Senate leaving to the President alone, to see, that their condition was complied with. In answer to this it may be said, the Senate are to advise and consent that the President make the treaty: they are not to make the treaty themselves. When they advise and consent unconstitutionally [unconditionally], they rely on the integrity of the President, that he will not suffer any words to be inserted in the paper, or omitted from it. In this case they rely, that he will strictly follow their advice. If he ratifies without again consulting them, he undertakes for the accuracy with which that advice has been followed. If he ratifies what they did not agree to, their security consists in this; that the treaty will, for that cause, not be the supreme law of the Land; and it cannot be concealed from the world by any official forms, since he must set forth the whole truth of the case in the ratification. The very nature of the power, vested in the Senate, implies, that they are to act upon something not yet complete; the completion of it is reserved to the President. Consequently the Senate may give their advice and consent without the very treaty, which is to be ratified being before them. To this it may be objected, that, according to these positions, the Senate may *now* advise and consent to the general matter of a treaty, which may not be formed for years to come, and thus forestall the judgment of their successors. My answer is, 1. that it is not necessary at this moment to decide upon this objection; because it is not the general matter of a treaty which is consigned to the wording of the President; it is only the simple act of suspending part of an article; which is very little more or less, than striking it out by a pen; and the words which the Senate have used, are apt words in themselves, for which none can be substituted, which can well create ambiguity.—2. If it were necessary to decide upon the objection, I would say, that it can scarcely ever happen, that the Senate will submit to the President to work up the general matter of a treaty in any form, which he shall approve.—3. But still the objection recurs: can they do so constitutionally?—I think not.—How then is this distinguishable from what they have now done? In the circumstance of the amendment being nothing more than (as has been already observed) a mere suspension or striking out; in the inevitable consequence, that if any deviation be made from the

sense of the Senate by the shapes of speech which may be chosen, it will be immediately detected; and in the certainty that the sense of the Senate will be expressed, unless there be a wilfull departure from it; which would amount to a cause of impeachment, would avail nothing in fact, and is not to be presumed.—4. As to the length of time beforehand, which my doctrine would allow to the Senate; the restriction would be this: if the President was once to pass his judgment upon it, whether in the negative or affirmative, the subject would be immediately ended; or if before he had passed his judgment upon it, a future Senate should by a vote of two thirds annul the preceding vote, it would be constitutionally abolished. So that the power of a succeeding Senate need never be supposed in danger. From these considerations, I conclude, that the President may ratify without submitting the new article to the Senate.

If these difficulties shall be cleared away in the President's mind, he will next arrive at the two great and momentous questions: 1. Whether to ratify, as the Senate have advised, or reject: 2. and what line of conduct is to be pursued, in either event.

1. The reasons for ratifying or rejecting have often passed thro' his mind; but as it will aid me in my own conclusions, to bring the principal of those reasons into one summary view, I beg leave to offer this concise statement.

A treaty is the act of two independent nations; neither having a right to dictate to the other; and each determining upon what it will yield or accept, partly from its sense of right; partly upon its own strength, and partly upon the inferiority and actual situation of its antagonist. Compare the U States and Great Britain together; and war from us would appear formidable to her no otherwise, than as it would interrupt her trade and manufactures. These being the only avenues through which G. Britain, as a nation, could have been really wounded by us, she went into the negotiation with no other apprehension of us, unless it might have been, that the supplies for the West Indies would be withholden. To counterpoise this, she calculated upon our aversion to war, founded upon our true policy: she was conscious of her own ability to enter into any commercial reprisals upon us; and understood the temper of our people too well to believe, that they would have *long* foreborne from the fruits of neutrality for the indulgence of national hatred. We know, that at one period the british ministry would have made war upon us:¹ her losses and our sincere neutrality perhaps changed this hostile disposition; but she must have been perfectly persuaded, that we could stipulate nothing in her favour, wch. could relieve her from present difficulties in the war with France.

Under these circumstances, what kind of a treaty could we expect? Not one dictated by ourselves; nor yet one, different from all that have ever been made on such occasions, on principles of compromise and mu-

¹ See Jay to Washington, July 21, 1794. *Correspondence of John Jay*, IV. 33.

tual concession. If the present constitution of the United States, which was the act of sister-states was an affair of accommodation; how could it be expected that two nations, widely alienated from one another, could agree on any other terms?

Let the treaty be reviewed under the following heads: 1. The rights, which we have obtained: 2. the rights, which we have surrendered: 3. the favors which we have gained: 4. miscellaneous matter.

My first purpose was to class the articles of the treaty under these different heads, and thus examine them individually. But *the paper*,¹ which you did me the honor of shewing to me, having gone into this [in] detail, I shall speak of them separately only where I differ from its writer.

1. The rights gained are the posts and compensation for the captures.²

2. The rights surrendered are

1. Satisfaction for the negros. The President will recollect the reasoning contained in the letter to Mr Jay in December last.³ This still strikes me, as unanswerably true; and I will add another reflection of no small weight; that, if the negotiators did not think proper to ascertain who was the first aggressor, every thing dependent upon this idea shoud have been buried; whereas the U. S. are to be burthened with the debts of individuals, solely because the several States are supposed to have been the first aggressors.

2. The right of sequestering or confiscating the debts, funds etc. of an enemy.⁴ It is a sound principle to prevent such acts: but it will be a subject of great clamor in the house of Representatives; as insinuating the apprehension of fraud in them; as being the symptoms of a desire to enlarge the authority to make treaties; as taking away one of the means of redress; and as influencing the questions now depending in Court, as far as an opinion can go. It is reciprocal, it is true, and important to commercial credit. But I wish the *principle* only had been declared, without stipulating against the *practice*. It would have been sufficiently operative, without being a direct attack upon the House of Representatives.

3. The rights surrendered by the 12th article, need not be spoken of; as it is to be suspended.

4. The rights of the settlers within the precincts and jurisdiction of the posts etc.⁵ I understand this as the paper does—not liable to much exception.

¹ Hamilton's elaborate reply, dated July 9, to the letter of July 3, in which the President (*Writings*, ed. Ford, XIII. 61-63) asks his advice as to ratification in much the same terms as those of his queries to the members of the cabinet. It is printed in Lodge's edition of Hamilton's works, IV. 322-363.

² Arts. II. and VII.

³ *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I. 509.

⁴ Art. X.

⁵ In Art. II.

5. The prohibition of our citizens to take commissions from foreign powers.¹ I understand this, as the paper does, liable to no exception.

6. The provision against reprisals, until justice be refused or unreasonably delayed,² will contribute to peace.

7. The prohibition of countenance to foreign privateers etc.³ This I understand as the paper does; liable to no objection.

8. I rank among the rights surrendered the clause respecting provisions being seizable.⁴ *The paper* has not taken into the account, that the *seizor* will be always the judge, whether they are so: that G. Britain has avowed her doctrine on the 8th of June 1793; and that she has again commented upon it in the same way by her late order.⁵

3. The favors which we have gained are

1. The India trade, and the power of supplying Canada etc. with European, Asiatic and domestic articles.⁶

The paper does not touch the great objection, that british vessels come so high up, while our's are admitted only so low down.⁷ It is a disadvantage; but it's value is not very important. It will be played off more against Mr Jay's vigilance, than for any other purpose.

2. The trade to the East Indies.⁸

From the article on this subject we certainly derive two advantages.

1. The conversion of what has been hitherto a favor into a compact; namely, a direct trade from the East Indies to the U. S. States. 2. the prohibition of higher duties on our exportations than on british exportations. And *the paper* supposes, that every thing else is left upon it's old footing; and the same indulgencies may be granted after the treaty, as before. This is apparently the case. But these doubts occur. 1. whether many American merchants will risque themselves upon the chance of receiving these indulgences in the face of a treaty; and knowing that they *may* be deprived of the opportunity of employing their spare time in going from the East Indies to China etc. with a coasting freight, they may not withdraw from the trade.—2. whether the probability is not greater, that the indulgencies *will* be withdrawn, after such a treaty than before it. For why has the british government expressly stipulated against the continuance of the privilege, if it was intended to leave a discretionary power to enforce the restriction, or not?

4. The miscellaneous matter of the treaty.

¹ Art. XXI.

² Art. XXII.

³ Art. XXIV.

⁴ In Art. XVIII. See Moore, *Digest of International Law*, VII. 675-679.

⁵ The text of the orders of June 8, 1793, is given in Moore, *International Arbitrations*, I. 300-301, and in *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I. 240; that of the orders of April, 1795, was never published. Moore, I. 310.

⁶ Art. III.

⁷ In the former case to the highest ports of entry on the rivers; in the latter, only to the mouths.

⁸ Art. XIII.

1. All our differences are closed. This is a most valuable quality; altho' we have made some sacrifices.

2. The adjustments as to the Mississippi and St. Croix are unexceptionable.¹

3. The *mode* of deciding on the captures² is agreeable to usage in one respect, and more favorable than usual in another. I wish, that the stipulation against *illegal* and *irregular* captures may be found broad enough for full satisfaction to our citizens.

4. The European trade stands upon the footing of reciprocity; not very important in any way. The prohibition of additional tonnage and additional duties deprives the U. S. of the power of discriminating between the british and other nations, is not unreasonable, while we mean to keep peace with Great Britain.³

5. The prohibition⁴ to make treaties, in derogation of the 24 and 25. articles cannot be important to us, as it is to last only during our amity with Great Britain; and while we are her *friends*, we surely cannot wish to assist her *enemies*. It cannot be important to France, because her treaty secures this point; and in any new negotiation, so much of the old treaty may be reserved.

Other articles are too small to require a comment.

Here then I return to the question, whether the President ought to ratify, as the Senate have advised, or reject?

Advantages and disadvantages, depending upon moral reasoning, cannot, like pounds, shillings and pence, be weighed in opposite scales. For want of a standard of certainty, let us bring them together in the following contrast.

1. Advantages.

1. Old bickerings settled; except as to impressments and provisions.

2. Indian wars at an end; at least those countenanced by G. Britain.

3. New opportunities for extending trade in Canada.

4. Posts surrendered.

5. Captures compensated.

6. Gr: Britain interested in securing to us the Mississippi.

2. Disadvantages

1. Loss of negros.

2. Assumption of debts due to british creditors in certain cases.

3. The lands which may be taken from the U. S. by the indulgence to the british settlers.

4. the *situation* of provisions.

3. Doubtful.

1. East India trade.

2. The European trade cannot be properly called doubtful; but it has no peculiar advantage on our side.

Independent of these pros and cons, arising from the face of the treaty, there are some other considerations, entitled to attention; wch. recommend ratification and dissuade rejection.

¹ Arts. IV. and V.

² Art. VII.

³ Arts. XIV. and XV.

⁴ In Art. XXV.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII.—39.

Those, which recommend ratification, are

1. that peace, or rather the non-interruption of our Commerce will be secured.

2. that the danger of being thrown into one set of foreign politics by an abhorrence of the outrages of another, will be so far cut up.

3. that it gives some prospect of extending our commerce with the british dominions.

4. that as it is not the interest of the U. S. to be on ill terms with France, lest we thereby throw ourselves too much on G. Britain, so vice versa, the U. S. ought to be on good terms with both. It is at least doubtful, whether it be the interest of the U. S. that there should be only *one* dominant power, or game-cock in Europe.

The reasons, that dissuade rejection, are

1. the latitude of authority, with which Mr. Jay was vested, and his not having exceeded it.

2. The little expectation of obtaining a much better treaty.

3. The possibility of the convulsions of France, re-inspiring G: Britain with her former arrogance.

4. The impression, which the refusal to ratify, will make upon our public, national character; merely because we have not all the advantage on our side. This idea I prefer to the one adopted by *the paper*; which supposes us to be called upon by our professions of neutrality to ratify.

5. The postponement of the surrender of the posts, and its consequences.

6. The exposure of the twenty senators to a general assault:¹ the consequent alienation of them from the Government: the victory to the minority in the Senate; who in conjunction with the majority in the house of representatives, will first be loud in their eulogiums on the President, and afterwards never be satisfied, unless they dictate to him. This reason is however of no consequence, if the President be satisfied, that it is right on other grounds to reject the treaty. It is only one of those little things, which may deserve some respect, where the scale of truth hangs in equilibrio.

To these considerations, stand opposed the opinion of a senator, who, under the signature of Americanus, imagines, that the suspension of the 12th article will suspend the whole of the treaty, except the first ten articles; and the late order, if genuine, for the capture of provisions. That opinion, if true, ought to arrest the ratification; but I cannot, upon any examination, which I have given the subject, discover the principles of it. The last eighteen articles are to expire, only in case the 12th cannot be arranged, before the expiration of two years after the war; and are not affected by any *intermediate* fate of the 12th article.² But the order for capturing provisions is too irreconcilable with a state of harmony, for the treaty to be put into motion during its existence. The

¹ The ratification was carried by a vote of 20 to 10.

² Art. XXVIII.

reasons are mentioned in the paper, and in another part of this writing. And if no expedient could be found for the emergency, it would be my opinion, that the treaty ought to be absolutely broken up; and if new negotiations could not be opened, that other views of our situation should be examined.

It is questionable whether the suspension of the treaty for so just a cause has not some benefits. 1. Before it is compleated, this campaign, if not the war, may perhaps be finished. 2. the passions of the public will have subsided. 3. Possibly some of the captures may have been decided, and some compensation made, in the ordinary course of proceeding, without the intervention of the treaty; so as to satisfy the people, that the british mean to do justice. 4. The subjects, omitted by Mr. Jay, to wit, impressments, and orders against the continuance of the capturing system, may be pressed with effect; tho' not as ultimate. 5. It enables the President, as will be seen under the next head, to bring back to himself the treaty, before it is ratified, and thus avoid all risque of censure.

2. The next enquiry is, what step the President will take upon either hypothesis of rejection or ratification. Upon that of rejection, there is but one; namely, an attempt to renew the negotiation.

My plan for the ratification, tho going to the same final object with the paper, is different in the means which it uses. It is the following: the actual position of political affairs in Holland: the actual position of our pecuniary affairs there, as communicated to me by the Secretary of the Treasury: the puerile appearance, which it will have, to be shifting ministers about in Europe; convince me, that Mr. Adams¹ ought not to be drawn over from the Hague to London. If, however, the President shall be pleased to determine otherwise, Mr. Adams's agency will not very materially change the measures, which I propose.²

I take the liberty then of suggesting: that a personal interview be immediately had between the Secretary of State and Mr Hammond, and that the substance of the address to him be this.

"I know, Sir, that you are acquainted with the late treaty between the U. S. and his britannic majesty; and presume, that you have seen the vote of the Senate, advising a ratification of it upon condition. That treaty being still subject to the negative of the President, is now before him, undetermined as to its fate. The candour which has reigned throughout our proceedings, induces me, with the permission of the

¹ John Quincy Adams, minister to the Netherlands.

² The ensuing paragraphs, containing the proposed address to Hammond, are printed in *A Vindication of Mr. Randolph's Resignation* (Philadelphia, 1795), pp. 30, 31. On July 13, the day after the date of this letter, the President directed Randolph to address Hammond as he proposed, and he at once did so. He then directed him to prepare the memorial which he had mentioned to Hammond, on the provision order, a form of ratification, and instructions to the person who was to manage the business in London. *A Vindication*, p. 31; Conway, pp. 267, 339, 340; Randolph to the President, July 20, in Sparks, *Washington*, XI. 45.

President, to explain to you, as the Minister plenipotentiary of his britannic majesty near the United States, what is the course of his reflection upon this momentous transaction. If his majesty could doubt the sincerity of the President's professions of a desire to maintain full harmony with the british nation; his doubt will vanish when he is told, Sir, as I now tell you, that, notwithstanding after the most mature consideration of the treaty, there are several parts, by no means coincident with his wishes and expectations; yet he had determined to ratify it, in the manner advised by the Senate. He had determined to put his hand to it, without again submitting it, even after the insertion of the new article, to the Senate.

"But we are informed by the public gazettes, and by letters, tolerably authentic, that vessels, even American vessels, laden with provisions for France, may be captured and dealt with, as carrying a kind of qualified contraband. If this be not true, you can correct me.

"Upon the supposition of its truth, the President cannot persuade himself, that he ought to ratify, during the existence of that order. His reasons will be detailed in a proper representation thro' Mr Hammond to his britannic majesty. At the same time, that order being removed, he will ratify without delay or further scruple. Of this also his britannic majesty will be informed in the most explicit and unequivocal terms.

"Now, Sir, the object of my interview with you arises from my recollection of your having expressed to me a wish, that the ratifications should be exchanged here, in order that you might have some agency in closing the treaty. I am thus led to believe, that it may not be disagreeable to you to undertake what I shall now have the honor of proposing to you.

"Supposing that Mr Jay's negotiation would absorb every controversy: that nothing would be left to be done for some time in the ordinary course of residence; or that Mr Pinckney would have returned to London before he was wanted there, he was dispatched as an Envoy to Madrid. He did not commence his journey until the 11. of May last. The Secretary of the Legation, Mr Deas,¹ is the only person remaining in London, as the political agent of the U S. Being desirous of consummating every thing here, as far as we can, it has occurred to me to state in a memorial to you the situation of the business, and the foregoing declaration of the President's purpose to ratify. This, we presume, will be immediately transmitted through you to the british ministry. The reply may be handed to Mr Deas. You will also be furnished with a copy of the form, in which the President means to ratify, when the order is rescinded.

"The President had indeed once thought to order one of our European ministers over to London to supply for this purpose the place of Mr Pinckney: but the most weighty objections render this impractic-

¹ William Allen Deas of South Carolina, who finally carried out the exchange of ratifications.

able. And it may be also conceived, that to send over a fresh diplomatic character, at this stage of the business, would neither be very easy, nor very expeditious.

"It is also contemplated by the President, to propose that, for the purpose of saving delay, the ratifications may be exchanged *here*. For, altho' he does not doubt the constitutionality of the Senate's act, and is advised too, that the proposed article, if agreed to by his britannic majesty, need not be submitted to them before ratification; yet he entertains serious doubts, whether he can himself ratify, without having the very article under his eye, after it shall have been assented to by his britannic majesty. The difference of time in the one form or the other will consist only in a voyage from London to Philadelphia. Provision will be made for the subscription in London of any papers, which *form* may require.

"You will oblige me, Sir, by giving me your sentiments on this statement."

According to Mr Hammond's reply, so will the Government conduct itself.

If the thing can be arranged with him, it is humbly offered to the President, as the best expedient. If it cannot, let us try, whether Deas cannot be so prepared, as to have little more to do than what an automaton would be equal to; that is, the mere delivery of papers, and the receiving of answers. If Deas cannot be substituted, then some of our European ministers must of necessity be sent over; unless some qualified person would go from hence, without eclat, in the character of a mere agent.

I have the honor, Sir, to be etc. etc.

EDM: RANDOLPH.

P. S. I forgot to add, as to the order for seizing provisions, a circumstance greatly critical. The reasons, adducted by Mr Adet against the treaty, are all against him. But if this order be tolerated, while France is understood to labour under a famine, the torrent of invective from France and our own countrymen will be immense.

3. *Virgil Maxcy on Calhoun's Political Opinions and Prospects*,
1823.

THE following letter, at present in the possession of the managing editor, is of interest in the paucity of Calhoun's published political correspondence for 1823 and the adjoining years. It is especially so because it shows him at that time pointedly adhering to the position on the tariff which he had taken in his celebrated speech of 1816. The letter thus supplements that which Calhoun wrote directly to Garnett on July 3, 1824 (*Correspondence*, p. 219). The communication of Calhoun to Maxcy on which it is in part based is not in the collection of his letters to Maxcy in the Library of Congress.

Virgil Maxcy was the son of Jonathan Maxcy, successively president of Rhode Island College (now Brown University), Union College, and South Carolina College. He was a prominent politician and lawyer in Maryland, and an ardent supporter of Calhoun. After having been solicitor of the treasury under Jackson, and *chargé des affaires* at Brussels under Van Buren, he was killed in February, 1844, (with Secretaries Upshur and Gilmer and others) by the explosion on board the *Princeton*.

TULIP HILL, near ANNAPOLIS

Nov. 16. 1823.

My dear Sir,

I have duly rec^d. your letter and felt certain that your impressions in relation to Mr. C—n's opinions respecting manufactures were founded in misapprehension. Frankness in the avowal of his opinions on all political questions and a readiness to assume the responsibility of defending them, are distinguishing traits in Mr. Calhoun's character. I have since the receipt of your letter had a communication with him on the subject of it. He thinks your mistake in relation to his opinions or rather your impression that he had expressed different opinions from those he entertains on the subject of manufactures, originated in his disapprobation of Mr. Baldwin's project,¹ which he considers violent in degree and altogether unnecessary. He thinks that little need be done to render the principal branches flourishing. For his opinions on this subject he refers such of his friends as feel an interest in knowing the extent of them, to a speech which he delivered in 1816, and which he thinks was republished from the *Intelligencer* into *Niles Register*.² He is surprised at Col. Taylor's³ misapprehension of him as he went over the whole ground with him, and he thought that he, (Col. Taylor) felt disposed to yield to the conclusion, that we ought to make such naval exertions as would enable us to keep open our connexion with our markets, in time of war, or so to modify the industry of the country as in some degree to render us independent in war of foreign markets, for the leading and necessary articles of supply. Col. Taylor appeared to him to prefer the first branch of the alternative. In the conclusion of his letter he desires me to say, that when you arrive at Washington, he will be happy to discuss the subject freely with you, and he concludes his letter in the following strong language, which I, who have known him most intimately for more than 15 years believe to be perfectly sincere: viz. "I may say with truth that I could not be tempted, even by the Presidency, to disguise or conceal my opinion on great points of National policy."

¹ The tariff bill brought in by Henry Baldwin of Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Committee on Manufactures, in April, 1821. See Stanwood, *American Tariff Controversies*, I. 180-199.

² *Works*, II.

³ Doubtless John Taylor of Caroline.

As to newspapers—altho' he may and perhaps ought to, be answerable that those which are devoted to him, shall not rest his pretensions on false foundations—yet it is not reasonable, that he should be made responsible for their exaggerations and extravagances.

I am happy to tell you that the Cr—d ticket is beaten in New York city.¹ Of the ticket opposed to it, 8 of the 10 are C—n's friends and the polls closed with a cry of "Victory for Calhoun" (*and not Adams*) "over Crawford". The impression is rapidly increasing that he will get this powerful state, without whose votes no candidate can be chosen by the Electors. Late information confirms the impression before pretty strong, that N^o. C—a has deserted C—d for C—n, and that Ohio is in a fair way of doing the same by Clay. The effervescence which has been excited in Pa. in favor of Jackson for the purpose of affecting the late Election of Gov. is beginning to subside and Calhoun to come up there again. I could give you sheets of extracts of letters from all parts—even N. England, shewing C—n's rapid increase of popularity—but I have not time. You will soon hear all at Washⁿ. The result of the whole in my mind is this, that no one of the Candidates stands any chance of getting a majority of the votes of the Electors except C—n, and as he is manifestly the second choice of nearly all parts of the Union where he is not first, if the election comes to the house, he is the only candidate upon whom a union or compromise is practicable.

I am with sincere regard yrs.

V. MAXCY.

To the Hon^{ble} R. S. Garnett,
Loretto, near
Fredericksburgh
Va.

¹ See Hammond, *History of Political Parties in New York*, II. 130–132. Henry Wheaton was the leading member of the successful ticket.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

Persia Past and Present. A Book of Travel and Research with more than two hundred illustrations and a map. By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, Professor of Indo-Iranian Languages, and sometime Adjunct Professor of the English Language and Literature in Columbia University. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1906. Pp. xxxi, 471.)

THE book is the outcome of a journey made by Professor Jackson in 1903 through Persia. Its plan naturally follows the course of his itinerary, which may be indicated in summarizing briefly the contents of the work. The opening portion (pp. 1-32) carries the reader from New York via Moscow, Baku, Tiflis, and Erivan to the Persian frontier at Julfa, and concludes with a chapter on the land, its history, and our interest in the country, the last section dealing with the influences that Persian art, architecture, literature, and religion have exerted upon the world, and with the indebtedness of the English language to the Persian. In the next section (pp. 33-174) is the account of the journey from Julfa to Tabriz, thence around Lake Urumiah (the Chaechasta of the Avesta) to Urumiah and on past Takht-i Suleiman to Hamadan, the two rival claimants to the site of Ecbatana. As Urumiah is supposed to be the scene of the early labors of Zoroaster, the interest in the great prophet of Iran naturally comes to the front and gives occasion for a chapter (only too brief) on Zoroaster and the Avesta. At Hamadan begin the cuneiform inscriptions with the Ganj Namah inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes, and during the next section of the journey (pp. 175-320) this subject is in the foreground. A special chapter is devoted to the inscriptions and the ever interesting story of their decipherment, and we have besides the account of the dangerous climb up the Behistan rock, and of the visits to Murghab (Pasargadae), the tombs of Naksh-i Rostam, and the ruined palaces of Persepolis. Interwoven with this is the description of the Sasanian sculptures of Tak-i Bostan, Kermanshah, and Naksh-i Rostam. Zoroastrianism receives its share in the accounts of the temple of Anahita at Kangavar, and the ruined fire-temple near Isfahan, while the modern aspects of that city are not overlooked. In the remainder of the book (pp. 321-446) the interest centres successively around Shiraz, the home of Hafiz and

Saadi; Yezd, the present stronghold of Zoroastrianism in Persia; and Teheran, the modern capital, with its suburb Rei identified with Ragha. From Teheran the author proceeded to the shore of the Caspian, where he took a steamer at Resht for Baku. His journey thence through Turkestan to Samarkand is to form the subject of another work.

As the subtitle indicates, the book is intended for two classes of readers—the specialist and the man of general cultivation; and the first point that claims recognition is the skill with which these partly diverse interests have been prevented from coming into conflict. For the general reader the work possesses all the elements that go to make books of travel in strange lands interesting reading. It is a story of danger and hardship encountered with courage, and overcome by patience, endurance, and perseverance in the pursuit of an important end—a story told with the utmost modesty, and enlivened with flashes of a humor that must have helped the author in many a situation. Politics and the details of trade relations do not enter into the plan of the book, but thanks to the keenness of Professor Jackson's observations and his unusual power of expressing them in language, the book presents a most vivid picture of the life in Persia both of the traveller and of the people by whom he was surrounded, of the present aspects of the country, and of the monuments of its past greatness. The unusual merit that constitutes the superiority of the book is that the reader is made to see all this through the eyes of one who has studied deeply Persia's history, literature, and religion, and he thus receives the benefits of a truer perspective and a far richer association of ideas than could be given by the description of what any ordinary traveller had seen. In this connection attention may be directed especially to the chapters headed, "Persia, the Land and its History, and our Interest in the Country", "Zoroaster and the Avesta", and "The Rock Inscriptions of the Great Persian Kings", which are models of the popular exposition of the results of scientific study. Another charm of the book is due to the author's love of nature and of literature, both well exemplified in the chapter on "Shiraz, the Home of the Persian Poets." In his enjoyment of the book the general reader may go from cover to cover without inconvenience from the scholarly work, which chiefly settles like a rich sediment in the foot-notes. In these moreover an awakened interest will find a guide to further information. The author fears that the general reader may check at some dozen of pages of discussion of the new readings of the Behistan inscription, but to the reviewer it seems that one would be unwilling to miss this insight into the nature of the main motive to which he is indebted for the production of such an attractive book.

For the scholar the book is valuable both for the richness of its bibliographical references and for its own contributions to the subject. Among these the work at Behistan would alone constitute a memorable achievement. A quotation from Rawlinson will indicate the difficulty and importance of the task: "I will not say much as to the danger

or difficulty of ascending the rock and reaching the upper part of the sculptures which are some 500 feet above the plain. I did not think much at the time of the risk to life and limb, but it must be remembered that Messrs. Coste and Flandin having been deputed to the spot with express instructions to copy the inscription returned *re infecta* declaring the sculptures to be absolutely inaccessible; and I may further add that although there is still something to be copied and much to be verified I have never heard but of one traveller accomplishing the ascent since the period of my last visit." The work of this traveller seems to have amounted to nil, and so after the lapse of more than half a century there remains for Professor Jackson the glory of being the first to give the world a verification of Rawlinson's great work. Three facts stand out clearly from his examination of the inscription: (1) the general accuracy of Rawlinson's work; (2) that there is still information to be gleaned, but to the fullest extent only by one abreast with the work in the subject (the author left the rock convinced that Foy's emendation of Bh. 4. 64: *ārštām* is the actual reading, while it is clear from his account that the most careful observer who was ignorant of this emendation would read with Rawlinson *abaštām*); (3) that this work should be done immediately on account of the disintegration of the rock. It must be a cause of deep regret that time did not permit Professor Jackson to verify the reading of the whole of the Old Persian text, especially as it might reasonably be hoped that the gleanings would prove richest in its least accessible parts.

Next in importance are the descriptions of present beliefs and practices: the detailed account of the Zoroastrian communities at Yezd (pp. 353-400) and Teheran (pp. 425-427, *cf.* also 119, 217, 273, 336-338, 403-404, 406, 413, 438, 440); the account of the Yezidis or devil-worshippers of Tiflis (pp. 10 *et seqq.*); and such legends as the version of the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy (p. 102) and of Alexander at Hamadan (p. 164). For the archaeologist there is the discussion of the identifications of various sites, especially important being the discussion with regard to Ecbatana; the accounts of diggings in the ash-heaps near Urumiah; the description of the temple of Anahita at Kangavar and of the fire-temple near Isfahan. Besides there are the descriptions of the various monuments, which are sometimes fuller than previous accounts (*e. g.*, p. 210); sometimes correct previous ideas (p. 282, n. 2); and are always valuable on account of their clearness. Finally there are numerous indications (pp. 163, 173, 242, 250, 407, 433) of places where excavations might be made with profit.

Two services of a broader nature to the cause of scholarship must at least be indicated: (1) the value to students of the early monuments of having their attention drawn to the modern conditions of the land; (2) the securing for Iranian studies a broader basis of that popular interest without which no branch of science can long thrive. The services rendered in this line to comparative philology by Max Mueller

are universally recognized, and the present work is admirably adapted to confer similar benefits upon Iranian studies.

The only criticism of the book to be offered here is on the positiveness of the attribution of the monuments at Murghab to Cyrus the Great. Weissbach's ascription of the inscription and relief to the younger Cyrus and his denial of the identity of the tomb with that described by the classic writers are entitled to mention, even if one does not (like the reviewer) believe them the more probable explanations.

In conclusion unlimited praise must be given to the make-up of the book, to the liberality of the index, and the execution of the map and illustrations, many of which are from unpublished photographs taken by the author or his friends.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

Homer and His Age. By ANDREW LANG. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1906. Pp. xii, 336.)

THE sturdy champion of Homeric unity has here given the Disintegrationists such a shaking up as they have rarely had before. And for all true believers what a consolation! Against the critics who regard the *Iliad* as the work of four or five centuries and so a medley of old and new, of obsolete and modern, Mr. Lang maintains that it is "the work of a single age, a single stage of culture, the poet describing his own environment." It is an age which has substituted cremation for burial of the dead; which retains bronze for arms while employing iron for tools; which keeps the huge Mycenaean shield now strengthened by bronze plates and has elaborated corselets and greaves. This age, he thinks, is certainly sundered from the Mycenaean prime by the century or two in which changing ideas led to the superseding of burial by burning; or by a foreign conquest and the years in which the foreign conquerors acquired the language of their subjects.

To begin with, Mr. Lang finds abundant *raison d'être* for the long epic in a society like that drawn in the *Odyssey*. There the minstrel "has an opportunity that never occurred again till the literary age of Greece for producing a long poem continued from night to night." True enough: does not Odysseus himself reel off a sixth of the *Odyssey* during one night in hall? Think, too, of poor Penelope's unbidden house-party three years running, with leisure for a dozen *Iliads* and *Odysseys* if Phemius had had a mind to sing them!

And to end with, our author makes as short work of the difficulty of handing down these long poems. They were preserved and transmitted, he declares, not by gilds of rhapsodists but by early written texts. It is interesting to recall how, years before Evans had dreamed of digging at Knossos, Lang had written in his Letter to Homer: "May we discover thee practising a new art and strange, graving Phœnician symbols on tablets of wood, or writing with a reed pen on slips of papyrus?" And now we actually find at Knossos not only thousands of inscribed clay tablets, but earthen cups of Early Minoan time bear-

ing cursive writing with a reed pen in sepia ink; so that S. Reinach infers the possibility of whole Minoan libraries—manuscripts written on palm-leaves, papyrus, parchment, and like perishable materials. Mr. Lang holds that, in an age when people could write and write freely, they did write down the epics; and that the epic texts existed in the Aegean script till Greece adapted to her own tongue the "Phœnician letters" as she did not later than the ninth or eighth century.

In the body of the book Mr. Lang deals first with "Loose Feudalism and the Over-Lord", finding a clear consistency in the character and position of Agamemnon throughout; next with the archaeology of the poems (Cremation, Armour, Bronze and Iron, the Homeric House), in all of which he holds that Homer "gives us an harmonious picture of a single and peculiar age." Yet he has to own that "the whole argument has no archaeological support. We may find Mycenaean corselets and greaves but they are not in cremation burials. No Homeric cairn with Homeric contents has ever been discovered; and, if we did find Homeric cairns, it appears from the poems that they would very seldom contain the arms of the dead." Of the desultory chapters that follow perhaps the most notable is "The 'Doloneia'", in which a very fair case is made out for the much-maligned Tenth Iliad.

Altogether, from frontispiece (Algonquin Braves under Mycenaean Shields) to finis, the book is one for which every Homeric student may well be grateful.

J. IRVING MANATT.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte.

VON HANS DELBRÜCK. Dritter Teil: *Das Mittelalter.* (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Stilke. 1907. Pp. vi, 700.)

THE bulky volume in which Professor Delbrück carries his subject through the Middle Ages is printed in large, clear type, and is indexed and furnished with numerous sketch-maps. The author's "framework" of political history is so generous as to make the book of interest to the general reader as well as to the critical scholar. He begins at once with Charles the Great and makes many interesting comparisons between the empire of 800 A. D. and of the Roman era, *e. g.*, the number of warriors, the method of service and of summons, equipment, maintenance, etc. The warrior under Charles must furnish an equipment equivalent in value to forty-five cows (a cow is reckoned at a solidus) or fifteen mares—the stock valuation of an entire village. The chapter on the conquest of the Saxons furnishes an interesting comparison with the Roman disaster in the Teutoberg Forest during the reign of Augustus. The author holds that the Roman frontier was, as it were, projected at one point, by Varus, into the wild German territory, leaving the Roman forces isolated. The opposite was true under Charles the Great, and his task was correspondingly less difficult. Thirty pages of the first book are given to Carolingian "Wehrpflichts-Capitularen".

Book two deals with the perfected feudal state. It describes the blending of the feudal elements of the time of Charles into a systematic whole and the building of the states on the ruins of the Carolingian empire. Sixteen pages are given to the battle of the Lech, the author closing with the statement—in opposition to Nitzsch, Waitz, and Breslau—that this battle “macht Otto I zum grossen Feldherrn”. Other chapters take up the battles under Emperor Henry IV., the conquest of the Anglo-Saxons by the Normans, the Norman constitution of war as it was developed in England, the Norman state in Italy, and the situation in the East which led up to the Crusades.

The third book treats of the science of war as it developed at the height of the Middle Ages. Knighthood as a calling is a central thought. Its foreshadowings from the time of Tacitus are shown, its development into a military profession, and the transition to a mercenary system. Strategy is treated briefly. Then follows a lengthy discussion of the art of war as illustrated in city life—in the Italian communes under Frederick Barbarossa; in the administration of Frederick II., in such German cities as Köln and Strassburg—and in the conquest of Prussia by the Teutonic Knights. The subject of English archery is developed in connection with the conquest of Wales and Scotland by Edward I. This book closes with a description of some thirty single campaigns, battles, or skirmishes, illustrating the opinions advanced by the author.

In his “Vorwort” to book iv., dealing with the later Middle Ages, Professor Delbrück says that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries bring a series of new phenomena in the conduct of war, which so modify the picture given thus far as to require a new division. These phenomena are not of such a sort as to make the transition from the old to the new forms a constant development. Nor do they stand to each other in an organic relation. They are rather “singularities”, which either disappear or first gain their true significance after centuries—as in the introduction of firearms or in the victories of an army of burgher and peasant “infantry-folk” over an army of knights. He proposes in the remaining chapters to show the particular phenomena of these centuries in their fundamental meaning and historical causality. By special examples he tries to show that the conduct of war in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was essentially the same as in the thirteenth or twelfth centuries, or even earlier—that is, that the new phenomena were not yet incorporated as part of the military system. The only exception he makes is the Swiss, whose history he treats separately in his final chapters.

The first battle in which we get a glimpse of the new order of things is the battle of Courtray, in 1302. The changes are suggested in the title of the chapter: “Phalangen-Schlachten. Burgerwehren und Landsturm-Aufgebote.” Crécy, in 1346, is a type of a number of battles illustrating archers fighting in combination with dismounted knights. Others chapters follow on the Osman Empire; the Hussites; the Condottieri, Ordinance Companies, and Free-Shooters. The volume closes

with a section devoted to the Swiss, who first, in the author's view, reveal modern tendencies in the conduct of war, not as occasional eccentricities but as fixed principles. The early "Ritter" and "Fussvolk" are not what are now called cavalry and infantry. A true infantry is first developed by the Swiss. In the battles of Laupen, Sempach, Granson, Murten, and Nancy we have once more an infantry comparable to the phalanx and legion. The origin of firearms and their place in the development of the subject will be discussed in the next volume.

C. T. WYCKOFF.

L'Église et l'Orient au Moyen Age: Les Croisades. Par LOUIS BRÉHIER. (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre. 1907 [1906]. Pp. xiii, 377.)

THIS is one of the volumes in the *Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, begun in 1898. In order to judge the book fairly it is necessary to state the publishers' purpose. They are attempting to carry out the project of Pope Leo XIII., the composition of an "histoire ecclésiastique universelle mise au point des progrès de la critique de notre temps". The volumes are not intended as manuals for secondary schools or for the general public, but rather for advanced students.

As a whole M. Bréhier's work is successful. It is a useful summary, dealing mainly, as the subtitle indicates, with the Crusades. But the first three chapters give an account of the relations between the East and the West before the period of the Crusades. The author was especially competent to write this portion because of his studies on *Les Colonies d'Orientaux en Occident au Commencement du Moyen Age* and *Le Schisme Oriental du XI^e Siècle* (1899). The volume ends with the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Viewed as a history of the Crusades, the most novel feature is the relatively large amount of space given to the account of the Christian missions in the East and the theoretical propagandists of the later centuries.

As this volume is intended as a guide for advanced students, it contains much bibliographical matter. The introduction is on "les sources et les instruments de travail". It contains some curious errors which produce a bad impression. The *Rolls Series* (p. xi) is credited with only ninety-eight volumes; the *Société de l'Histoire de France* with only eighty-five volumes; and there are other similar misstatements. In fact, this general bibliography needs to be carefully corrected and brought down to date. On the other hand, the bibliographies for the separate chapters are well selected and comparatively full. Occasionally (e. g., pp. 88, 117, 183) German fragmentary editions of French and English sources are cited instead of the complete and more satisfactory French or English editions. Throughout the notes the proof-reading has been careless.

As a whole the facts concerning the Crusades are stated accurately.

Some of the misstatements which occur may have been due to the need of brevity, as in the account of the Peasants' Crusade (p. 69). Here the different bands are confused, and what is true for some is stated as true for all, or else supplied to the wrong bands. The author does not quote Theodor Wolff, *Die Bauernkreuzzüge* (Tübingen, 1891), and it seems probable from his account that he did not know the work. There are a number of similar minor errors in various parts of the book. Occasionally the author makes an exaggerated statement, as on p. 32: "A partir des premières années du x^e siècle les pèlerinages en Terre Sainte deviennent de plus en plus fréquents. Il n'est guère de grand personnage laïque ou ecclésiastique dont les biographes ne mentionnent un et quelquefois plusieurs voyages à Jérusalem."

In one respect the work is very disappointing. M. Bréhier does not include in his plan any account of the influences exercised reciprocally by the Franks and the Eastern people with whom they came into contact. Except from a general statement in the conclusion (p. 354) he ignores them entirely. In fact, he would necessarily minimize them, if one may judge his attitude by an entirely erroneous sentence on p. 100: "L'histoire des principautés franques au xii^e siècle en effet est celle d'une lutte perpétuelle contre les ennemis qui les entouraient de tous les côtés à la fois." It is time that this point of view should be banished, even from a manual. It would be a more accurate statement to say that during a considerable portion of the twelfth century the crusading states suffered remarkably little from warfare. M. Bréhier also ignores almost entirely the fact that, in the twelfth century, the Franks who were settled in the Holy Land attempted to maintain peace and build up strong commercial colonies. Consequently there is no account of the relations between the Roman Church and the Armenian kings or of the far-reaching influence exercised by the Franks on the Armenian civilization. Moreover, the tolerance which sprang up in the Holy Land from the intimate contact between the Roman Christians, the Greeks, the various sects of heretics, and the Mohammedans is unmentioned.

Yet, in spite of these errors and omissions, an astonishing number of facts is stated accurately. Considering the paucity and the defects of other manuals on the Crusades, this volume with its bibliographical data is a welcome addition, and forms a useful guide to the external history of the Crusades.

DANA C. MUNRO.

The Economic Development of a Norfolk Manor, 1086-1565. By FRANCES GARDINER DAVENPORT, Ph.D. (Cambridge: at the University Press. 1906. Pp. xi, 105, cii.)

If more work of the kind Miss Davenport has accomplished had been done a generation ago, much mistaken generalization and false interpretation of history would not have been printed to confuse the student. With no theory to establish and no prejudice to maintain, she gathered all the information that could be procured relating to a single

Norfolk manor, arranged it logically, and thus furnished a contribution to our knowledge of medieval economic conditions that is thoroughly trustworthy. Not the least part of her labor lay in getting together her materials, which consisted of widely scattered manorial documents, some of them in private hands, and some in the great collections of the Public Record Office, the British Museum, and elsewhere. Many of these she has printed in whole or in part as appendixes, and they form an interesting and useful part of her book.

Comparison of an Elizabethan survey with the entries in Domesday Book helps her to show in her first chapter the topography and territorial development of the manor, the amount of land held by different classes of the population, and the general correspondence between the number of free and servile messuages at the later date and the number of free and unfree tenants at the earlier. Three chapters are then devoted to the history of the demesne. She is able to describe in detail what this was and how it was managed in the reign of Edward the First, a time when manorial changes were few and insignificant; but, unfortunately, owing to lack of materials there then follows a period of seventy years about which she can tell us little. When the tale is resumed with the aid of ministers' accounts for the years 1376-1378, it is shown that the organization and management of the manor had been totally changed; and though the changes are described, the causes of them must be left to surmise. The lord had ceased forever to have the demesne lands tilled on his own account. He preferred to lease them for a term of years, and during the next century there was a marked tendency to lengthen the term till the tenure developed into fee-farm. In her account of the tenants and their land the author follows the same plan as in her account of the demesne. She traces concisely the situation at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the disorders and confusion prevalent two generations later, and the gradual evolution of the copyholding yeomen from the sokeman and the bondman; and in doing so she gives us many concrete facts of interest and importance. It cannot be too much deplored that the years that brought the downfall of the ancient manorial system are just the years for which her materials were wanting. It was a broken organization and decaying institutions, uncertainty and disorder, on which the ministers' accounts of 1376-1378 cast a brief and lurid light. The old order had fallen into a confusion out of which were slowly to emerge security of tenure and industrial freedom. That we are left in ignorance of what had happened on this particular manor to cause the confusion is in no wise the fault of the author, however much the gap here in her history may diminish our satisfaction with it.

The reviewer feels that the author would have added to the usefulness of her book by making some comparison of conditions on the manor she studied with conditions that are known to have prevailed elsewhere. In the case of the rate of rent she does this. If she had done the same in other cases, much that she tells us would have added sig-

nificance for students that are not already well acquainted with the field in which her work has lain. Thus, the demesne land consisted mostly of considerable blocks, and little of it lay in scattered strips in the open fields; much of this land also was cultivated more than two successive years. Again, in 1272 there were only about 150 acres of land burdened with heavy services—about one-eighteenth of the whole; a bondman seldom held more than five acres; and upwards of a hundred bondmen lived outside the manor. In these and other particulars Forncett seems to have differed from the "typical" manor that has long figured in historical writings, and the differences deserve to be noted and interpreted. The author was under no obligation, however, to give this interpretation. She preferred to furnish merely a clear and detailed statement of information about a single manor derived from contemporary documents; and having done this, she deserves thanks for a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the manorial system and its decay.

THOMAS WALKER PAGE.

Geschichte des lateinischen Kaiserreiches von Konstantinopel. Von ERNST GERLAND. Erster Teil. *Geschichte der Kaiser Balduin I. und Heinrich, 1204–1216.* (Homberg v. d. Höhe: Im Selbstverlag des Verfassers. 1905. Pp. vii, 264.)

THIS is part of volume II. of a *Geschichte der Frankenherrschaft in Griechenland*, but is published before volume I. Dr. Gerland intends the first volume to contain a history of the Fourth Crusade, and volume III. and the later volumes the history of the lesser states, the Venetian and Genoese colonies, and the rule of the Knights of St. John at Rhodes. Of especial interest is the author's statement that he hopes in the final volume of the whole work to discuss the economic history of the period and its bearing upon the general course of events.

For ten years Gerland has been working on this history. To him has been intrusted the duty of making serviceable to scholars the wealth of material left by Hopf. As is well known, Hopf was unsurpassed in his ability for collecting data from the most varied sources, and had a wonderful fund of information. Unfortunately he seems to some extent to have been swamped by the wealth of his material. He produced only fragments of the great work which he had planned. Since his death his apparatus has been in the hands of Streit, then of Röhrich, and is now at the Royal Library at Berlin. Every student of the period must feel gratified that an able scholar is at length in a position to make use of the results of Hopf's labors.

Yet Gerland's task is not a mere reworking of Hopf's manuscript. Any one familiar with the latter's methods realizes that his material must be rearranged so that a pragmatic history may be written, as it is at present an undigested mass, arranged chronologically. Moreover, only a scholar who is well equipped for the task could make such use

of the material. It would be very unjust to underestimate Gerland's own work.

The second volume appears first because the first book of the manuscript which Hopf had prepared on this subject has been lost. Gerland thinks that Streit must have destroyed it. Whether this is true or not, 216 pages of manuscript, including the previous history and the account of the Crusade, are no longer in existence. This lengthy introduction to a short review seems necessary for the sake of those who are not acquainted with Hopf's work and the vicissitudes of his literary legacy. It is more excusable because the portion of a volume which we have does not lend itself to review as a completed book would.

This part begins with the election of the Emperor Baldwin in 1204 and extends to the death of his brother Henry in 1216. Its greatest service is that it clearly portrays the ability of the Emperor Henry and shows that he was the real founder of the Latin Empire. His task was extremely difficult. He was constantly harassed by attacks from the Bulgarians and from the Greek rulers in Asia Minor. The Venetians, to whom the conquest had been mainly due, exacted their full pound of flesh; their disregard of everything save their own selfish interests was an almost constant hindrance to the strengthening of the Empire. Only when their own policy or needs made it imperative did they render any effective aid, and then Henry was quick to profit by it. The contests with the partisans of Boniface of Montferrat were also injurious. The settlement of ecclesiastical matters offered many problems: the questions arising between the Greek and Roman Christians; the division of the offices between the Venetians, Pisans, and other Franks; the secularization of church property; the relation of the Venetian Patriarch Morosini to the pope, the papal legates, the emperor, the Venetians, and others—to mention only a few of the problems which confronted the emperor. All these are ably treated by Gerland.

The attitude of Innocent III., which it has been so difficult to understand in many cases, is explained by the author as the result of his preoccupation with the idea of a new crusade which should proceed by way of Constantinople and Nicaea. This would explain, Gerland thinks, his attitude as peacemaker between all the contending parties and interests, and his willingness to pardon or overlook many actions which he must otherwise have condemned. In this connection it is very interesting to compare Gerland's view with the work of Luchaire on Innocent III.

In many cases Gerland makes shrewd conjectures concerning the underlying causes of events. As a whole these seem very plausible. Gerland is careful to throw in such phrases as "*Leider sind wir über den Gang dieser Verhandlungen sehr schlecht unterrichtet*" and "*ich glaube es annehmen zu dürfen.*" Unless the qualifying phrases are carefully noted, others may be led into error and may accept Gerland's ingenious deductions as of equal value with the mass of his statements.

This first part is supplied with a threefold index. A few maps would greatly increase its value.

DANA C. MUNRO.

The History of England from the Accession of Henry III. to the Death of Edward III., 1216-1377. By T. F. Tout, M.A., Professor of Medieval and Modern History in the University of Manchester. [*The Political History of England*, edited by WILLIAM HUNT, D. Litt., and REGINALD L. POOLE, M.A. Volume III.] (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1905. Pp. xxiv, 496.)

PROFESSOR TOUT contributes the third of the volumes of the *Political History of England*. It goes without saying that the uniformly high standard of this series suffers nothing at the hands of Professor Tout. In some respects, in a freshness and newness of viewpoint, the volume has an advantage over its predecessors. For this, however, the author must share the credit with the peculiar opportunity offered by the field assigned him. This part of English history has been somewhat neglected by English historians of the last generation. To understand how much, one has only to recount the imposing monographs which have appeared upon the earlier or later periods and compare them with the somewhat meagre array of modern English authorities which the bibliography offers, especially for the part which precedes the reign of Edward III. If, however, English scholars have neglected this period, foreign scholars, particularly the French, have not. A vast array of continental sources has been made accessible, to say nothing of the many and valuable researches of French scholars that have given new importance to events which English writers have been in the habit of passing over altogether or leaving somewhat in the obscurity of background. Professor Tout has put the most of this material under tribute.

It is not possible, however, in the space allotted to this review to do more than note some of the more interesting modifications of accepted views. Thus the Pope appears as the real successor of William Marshal (p. 17). His policy is not to crush English liberty, but to prevent "Englishmen from flying at each other's throats" (p. 18). Something, moreover, is to be said even for Eleanor's uncles (pp. 54, 57). They were by no means such a bad lot as Matthew of Paris would have us believe. Again, in the troubles of the next reign Boniface was not unfriendly to Edward nor had he any idea of quarrelling with either Edward or Philip. No one was more surprised than he, apparently, that his unfortunate *Clericis laicos* should have raised such a disturbance (p. 200).

The author follows Bémont in finding a place for that disembodied ghost, the so-called *Statutum de tallagio non concedendo* (cf. p. 208 with Bémont, *Chartes des Libertés Anglaises*, pp. xliii, xlv, and 87). He also shows a masterly comprehension of Edward's policy (pp. 138

and 139), but does not believe that Edward deserves the credit for the peace which prevailed within England during his later years so much as Boniface's unfortunate attempt at intervention in the Scottish affair and the lucky escheat of some of the great baronies (pp. 216-224).

In the struggles of Edward II.'s reign the author sees more of personal rancor and shameless self-seeking on the part of noble-born politicians than of any comprehensive or far-sighted grasp of constitutional principles. In this he will be supported by most scholars, yet we would like to question the statement (p. 243) that the complete "ignoring of the commons" in 1310 was not due to "aristocratic jealousy". If not jealousy, surely contempt, and the two are so closely allied that it is hard to distinguish sometimes. Other statements also may be challenged. Justice is not done to the contracting parties in calling the indemnity offered to Prince Louis in 1217 "a bribe" (p. 13). Nor can the reissue of the charter of the same date be called "its final form"—even "substantially" (*ibid.*). It is assigning too much importance to Henry's council of regency to say that from this council arose the *idea of limited monarchy* (p. 29). The suggestion (pp. 116, 117) that Earl Simon deliberately sacrificed the men of London to the necessities of his plan of battle at Lewes hardly does justice to Simon, nor is it consistent with later estimates of his character. On the other hand, the introduction of the popular element in the famous Parliament of 1265 seems to have been an afterthought on Simon's part and due rather to his necessities than to any "boldness and largeness of his spirit" (p. 120). It is difficult to see how the passage of the Severn at Kempsey (p. 126) reveals Simon's skill when the withdrawal of Edward from Worcester made the passage possible. The skilful strategist and tactician of the Evesham campaign is not Simon but Edward. Again, the great custom of 1275 was more than an expedient to raise revenue. It was substituted not so much for the old land-tax as for the irregular levies of prise (p. 148). The date 1279 is a little early to speak of Parliament as "the estates" (p. 151). It is scarcely more accurate to say that Parliament "passed" a statute at a time when the legislative function of Parliament was still confined to the "humble petition" (*ibid.*). The statement (p. 152) that "all medieval laws were rather enunciations of an ideal than measures which practical statesmen aimed at carrying out in detail", can scarcely be meant to be taken seriously. Louis X.'s posthumous child was a son not a daughter (p. 295). The character of Edward III. is somewhat overdrawn. At all events one could hardly style him a "fluent and eloquent speaker in . . . English" (pp. 310, 312). The possession of Berwick by the English, after Halidon Hill, was in no sense "final" (p. 320). The statement that the death of the elder Artevelt marked "the end of the Anglo-Flemish alliance" should at least be qualified (p. 349). One hesitates to accuse the author of not having read the Statute of Laborers. But he certainly could not have read carefully or at least recently when he made the statement (p. 373): "The statute provided

that prices, like wages, should remain as they had been before the pestilence." It is, moreover, difficult to understand how the employers suffered more than the laborers under the statute.

The book is not without traces here and there of careless writing. Thus on page 3 the somewhat startling statement is made that "the dead king had lately shown . . . rare energy". So Isabella, the wife of Edward II., is described (p. 292) as "a woman of strong character . . . with [a] lack of morals and scruples". Other instances might be cited which fall under lapses of taste. It certainly does not do Bruce justice to call him a "clever adventurer" (p. 262), or Owen Tudor, a "traitor" (p. 414).

It is unfortunate that the plans of the editors do not allow more space for foot-notes in this excellent series. It is not only that the author frequently needs the foot-note to justify his position, but to satisfy the reader that he is getting the result of scholarly care and is not being led astray by the vagary of the author or the carelessness of the proof-reader. Note, for example, in the present work the group of dates connected with the series of brilliant exploits of the Scots of the years 1312-1315, where there is considerable divergence from the ordinary dates. So too one should like to know if the author has anything more than the questionable authority of Villani to support his "three small cannon" which Edward "dragged about" with him in his Crécy campaign (p. 364). So also in the light of the somewhat extensive literature upon the Black Death and the widely divergent views of creditable authors, the simple assertion that this dreaded pestilence was the bubonic plague (p. 370) is hardly sufficient. Still more to the point is the account of the battle of Poitiers. Here the author quite justly rejects Froissart and follows le Baker, yet not altogether, since his narrative is also influenced by Chandos Herald, particularly in his efforts to trace the movements of the two armies. But Chandos Herald, as well as Froissart, especially since the publication in 1899 of Denifle's *Désolation des Églises*, has also fallen under disfavor. In a note added to the appendix the author promises to justify his narrative later. It is to be hoped that this may be done, but there are a lot of other statements that one would also like to see justified or at least supported by foot-notes for the guidance of the student.

The book is accompanied by the customary bibliography and also by three useful maps.

BENJAMIN TERRY.

La Foi Religieuse en Italie au Quatorzième Siècle. Par CHARLES DEJOB. (Paris: A. Fontemoing. 1906. Pp. 439.)

THE thesis which Professor Dejob maintains in the book under consideration is that, contrary to the general impression disseminated by writers like Burckhardt and Voigt, the fourteenth century in Italy was one of profound and simple faith, of sincere attachment to pope, clergy, and monastic orders. The critics who have argued from the

corruption of Italian morals in the fifteenth century to the lack of religious faith in the fourteenth have committed a double error, psychological and historical; for they have failed on the one hand to realize that moral corruption is not the effect of incredulity but its cause, and on the other hand they have neglected, under the conviction of their own assumptions, that thorough investigation of the contemporary chronicles which would have proved to them conclusively the conservative spirit prevailing in Italy in the days of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. Such originality of thought as there was in Italy led rather to the scientific triumphs of Galileo and Vico than to any development of the metaphysical speculation on which free thought is founded.

The author maintains his thesis in a very broad treatment of the social, religious, and literary conditions in Italy in the fourteenth century. He shows how, *a priori*, little interest in heresy could be expected in a society still largely feudal, and wholly medieval in the immediacy of its violences and its attachments; how the life of people from a Visconti to the meanest serf was bound up inseparably with the church—the general clearing-house for all business of state as well as the house of worship for all people. He analyzes the literature of the Babylonian Captivity and finds that M. Deprez was near the truth in maintaining that the French kings were pretty weak jailers in the days of Crécy and Poitiers; even that during the Babylonian Captivity “le véritable prisonnier avait été le monarque français”. He examines the writings of Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Sacchetti, Salutati, and the lesser chroniclers, and finds them on the whole naïve, conservative, and deeply religious. We have as little cause to regard Italy in the fourteenth century as a nation of schismatics or heretics from the occasional satires of Petrarch or Boccaccio as we have to imagine France unbelieving in the days of *Tartuffe*, or Rome “antimilitariste” in the days of the *Miles Gloriosus*.

M. Dejob's book shows a mastery of the literary sources of the fourteenth century in Italy. Whether he has made the most scholarly use of his sources is open to grave doubt. He holds a brief for orthodoxy. While refusing to allow great significance to Petrarch's statement that the loss of good manuscripts has caused more harm than commerce with demons, he attributes universal assent to the praise of the clergy by the chronicler de Mussi, reported by Muratori: “Nisi clerici castis exemplis nos instruerent jugiter ambitioni et deliciis nostris modus non esset.” While a Farinata is no argument for Italy at large, a Saint Catharine of Siena is typical. And, as for the main thesis of the book, that heresy in Italy followed moral corruption, it is hard to see how moral corruption could have gained the momentum necessary to disturb the church unless the faith of Italy had been very much weakened by the skepticism of the latest Hohenstaufens and the sectaries of Joachim and Dolcino.

The author seems to have missed something of the birthright of lucidity of style which we are accustomed to look for in every French

writer. He obscures the point at issue often by an excessive multiplication of instances, reminding us of a catalogue rather than of a chapter. A few misprints mar the pages: "treizième" for *quatorzième* (p. 112); "ester" for *rester* (p. 162); "Nevel's Cross" for Neville's Cross (p. 167).

D. S. M.

A History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe. By DAVID JAYNE HILL, LL.D. Volume II. *The Establishment of Territorial Sovereignty.* (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1906. Pp. xxv, 663.)

THE period covered by Dr. Hill's new volume is that from the beginnings of the Hundred Years' War to the Peace of Westphalia—1313-1648. It is a period far richer in diplomatic activity than the medieval centuries which were his earlier theme. "The field", to borrow from his preface his own excellent summary, "is occupied by the conflicts of national states, first for coherence and then for expansion. After they become disengaged from the fetters of feudalism, instead of two great antagonists contending for world supremacy, we behold a group of powerful monarchies struggling with one another for primacy. It is in this contest that Italy, designated as their prey, becomes their political teacher. Germany, France, Spain, and finally England all enter the arena of contention more or less under the influence of the imperial idea. Germany desires to recover its ancient preponderance in Italy; France pivots its international activity upon adventures of expansion; Spain, having obtained possession of Naples, aims at controlling the whole peninsula; and England covets the crown of France. But the Papacy and Venice frustrate for a time all foreign schemes to obtain supremacy in Italy; the system of Italian equilibrium becomes a model for Europe; and, as in the earlier period Italy was rescued from subjection to imperial power by diplomatic combinations, so the national monarchies, after aiming at indefinite expansion and striving to outstrip one another by drawing into their service the forces of their allies, finally adjust themselves to a system of balanced and co-ordinate power based upon the principle of territorial sovereignty."

Through this labyrinth of changing aims and changing systems, of intrigue and double-dealing, Dr. Hill guides us with a sure eye and a firm hand. While he is alive to every advance in the methods of international intercourse—the institution of permanent embassies, the official transmission of despatches, the diplomatic use of secret ciphers, the employment of the modern vernaculars—it is increasingly clear that what interests him most is not diplomacy but international development. To a much larger extent than earlier diplomatic historians—even than Flassan, who found it wise to add to the title of his "*Histoire de la Diplomatie Française*" the explanatory alternative, "*ou de la Politique de la France*"—he has included in his narrative the general history of his period. But, if this somewhat narrows his space for the details of

negotiations, it enables him more clearly to set forth their deeper causes and results; and it is in this luminous exposition of the broader bearings of diplomacy that the lasting worth of Dr. Hill's work is likely to be found.

Not that his study has lacked minuteness. His reading has been singularly broad and thorough, and the bibliographies appended to his chapters form a most useful introduction to the vast and multiplying literature of his subject. Few titles of serious importance are wanting, and there is seldom a slip in the description. If he nowhere indulges in polemics, his carefully worded verdicts show a clear sense of the controversies still unsettled; and his dicta, though often open to dissent, do not transcend the fair limits of opinion. The field in which he shows himself least sure-footed is that of historical geography. Ducal Burgundy and Franche-Comté more than once change places (pp. 134, 297, 300), and it must be Franche-Comté of which he is thinking when he calls (p. 383) the Duchy of Burgundy "so important in securing a safe frontier to France". The Swiss cantons are sometimes miscounted (pp. 108, 287). The Austrian lands pawned to Charles the Bold did not connect the separated parts of his domain or even lie between them, and the Breisgau is not in Elsass (p. 108). The Ortenau should not lose its article and be coupled with Hagenau, as if it were a town instead of a district; and it might have been well to make it clear, too, that by Hagenau the *Landvogtei* is meant (pp. 326, 329). To speak (p. 358) of Charles V.'s "lands on the Upper Rhine, Elsass, and Württemberg" is to imply that Elsass is not on the Upper Rhine or that Württemberg is. The proximity of the Palatinate to France and the Netherlands (p. 556) was hardly such as to help explain its Calvinism: neither approached it closely, and there were nearer refuges for the exiles of both.

Nor can he be unquestionably followed in his other excursions outside the realm of diplomacy. Once he essays a description of a battle (p. 127): "An avalanche of thirty-five thousand mountaineers, armed with terrible pikes and powerful crossbows, swept down the steep slopes" upon the "sixty thousand Burgundian soldiers" "concentrated . . . between the deep Lake of Morat and the mountain-wall that rises above it." But the Lake of Morat is not a deep one, there is no mountain-wall in the neighborhood, and the Swiss had first to dislodge a Burgundian force from the plateau before they could sweep down (not, so far as is known, "concealed and protected by the foliage") the gentle hill-slope to the lake. As to their numbers and their weapons let his military critics dispute. Students of the Reformation, too, will be puzzled by his conception of "Zwingli's idea of congregational self-government" (pp. 424, 434), and will hardly accept unqualified his sentences as to the Protest and its Diet. They may even be tempted to smile at seeing Denifle's assault on Luther as a theologian and as a man cited as an authority on his political significance. But slips such as

these—and the present reviewer has found not many—are trifling blemishes in a book of such wide and conscientious erudition.

Maps and tables again enhance the usefulness of the work, which should take rank among the best of our books of reference.

GEORGE L. BURR.

Histoire de la Pragmatique Sanction de Bourges sous Charles VII.

Par NOËL VALOIS, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1906. Pp. cxcii, 288.)

ONE hundred and two documents are here published, drawn from the archives of the parlements of Paris and of Poitiers; the correspondence of Martin V. and the confessor of Charles VII.; the formularies of the Chancery; the Trésor des Chartes; special compilations pertaining either to the council of Basel or to the question of Gallican liberties in the registers of St. Martin de Tours, St. Étienne de Bourges and Ste. Croix d'Orléans, together with the archive collections of Paris, the Vatican, the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the libraries of Poitiers and Carpentras. Aside from their value in the first instance, many are interesting for the information which they furnish upon the law and the diplomacy of the period; from the point of view of language; or merely as specimens of judicial eloquence. The element of style is especially to be remarked in the two important memoirs drawn up by Jean Jouvenal des Ursins.

The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges was the logical sequence of the findings of the reforming councils of the fifteenth centuries. At the council of Basel the question of the reform of the church in head and members was still an issue. Nicholas of Cusa, one of the most passionate adversaries of the curia, there revived the principles of Gerson, but drew from them conclusions which the latter would have disavowed. Eugenius IV. in vain attempted to stem the flood. Driven from Rome by his revolted subjects and abandoned by most of the cardinals, he finally was compelled to yield, and the acts of Basel were published in the name and with the bull of the council and not under the name and seal of the pope. The acts of the council re-established the election of bishops by chapters; laid down educational and moral qualifications for the bishops; prescribed the regular holding of provincial councils; limited the right of excommunication and interdict and of appeals to Rome; established regulations governing the election and conduct of the pope; and abolished the annates required for the confirmation or collation of benefices.

The secular princes were not slow to avail themselves of the political advantage afforded by the findings of the council. After the treaty of Arras and the death of Bedford, when the tide of success was unmistakably flowing in favor of the French crown, Charles VII. frankly took advantage of the findings of the reform councils and the weakness of

the pope to establish the Gallican liberties on so firm a basis that no assault of Rome ever after wholly overthrew them. The Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges reproduced almost literally the chief findings of Basel concerning the supremacy of general councils, liberty of episcopal elections, suppression of annates, and limitation upon appeals to Rome. Yet in considering the revolutionary nature of this action, which overthrew the edifice of the medieval papacy almost completely, one needs to guard against going too far and rashly concluding that the whole fabric of the church was changed. It is well to bear in mind that in the fifteenth century no one contested the church's right of teaching or of possession; nor of interdicting any of the manifestations of the Catholic faith. The aim of the Pragmatic Sanction was to define clearly the ties which bound the clergy of France to the Holy See, without intention of breaking them, and to emancipate the church and people of France from "the yoke of an undue servitude".

The student of the history of the Hundred Years' War will find it of interest to follow the influence of its events upon the progress of these negotiations. For example, at Paris where the government of the constable Armagnac had refused to recognize the new pope unless the liberties of the church of France were guaranteed (March, 1418), the concordat of Martin V. would not have had any chance of adoption if at this very moment the atrocious revolution of the Burgundian party had not been successful. It immediately took the other course and sustained the prerogatives of the papacy with as much ardor as their opponents had advocated the integrity of Gallican liberties; an ordinance of September 9, 1418, entirely annulled the March decree and declared the concordat of Martin V. obligatory in the Burgundian provinces of France. The same régime obtained in the provinces of France under direct English domination.

Pierre Cauchon, the famous bishop of Beauvais, before whom Jeanne d'Arc was tried, owed his appointment to this circumstance, for Martin V. conferred the bishopric upon him. It is an interesting speculation whether Cauchon would have become bishop if the chapter of Beauvais had enjoyed the right of election, as the findings of Basel provided; and whether the fate of Jeanne d'Arc would have been otherwise if the bishop of Beauvais had not presided at her trial.

Another interesting feature is the conduct of the University of Paris at this time. Although formerly the university had sustained the cause of Gallican liberties, about 1411 it perceived that it had more to gain by support of pontifical prerogative, and from that hour both in Paris and at Rome pleaded for the "reserves" of the Holy See.

The inconsistency of the English policy in France "*qui ne se piquait pas de logique*" is another interesting fact. From the time of Wyclif England had strenuously opposed the claims of the papacy and was the most ardent supporter of the independence of the English church, yet in France in the fifteenth century the government found it convenient to

support the papal cause for the reason that the French crown was in alignment with the party of church reform. In a word the relations of France to Martin V. during the period of transition which followed the council of Constance may be characterized as follows: on the English side a complete accord, though one radically inconsistent; on the French side an attitude of independence of the Holy See more apparent than real.

The double policy of the Duke of Bedford is partially to be explained by the fact that he was the English regent in France. Yet Bedford's conduct has never been entirely explained. M. Valois does not make the attempt, but is skeptical of Luce's explanation to the effect that Bedford needed the pope's support in order to put an end to the dissension between his brother the Duke of Gloucester and his ally the Duke of Burgundy. Bedford's advocacy of the papal cause was far from being disinterested and was not even wholly a matter of politics. He seems to have hoped to obtain concessions from the Holy See as reward for his support. When Martin V. refused, Bedford in retaliation labored to restore the "liberties", but was too cautious to abandon his old course and finally executed the constitution of Martin V. of April 13, 1425, in spite of the opposition of the parlement of Paris.

In concluding his preface M. Valois modestly says: "I do not flatter myself that I have exhausted the subject even thus limited [that is, between the dates 1418-1461]. Upon certain points it will be possible to enter more into detail. I do not think, however, that future research will sensibly modify the great lines of the present work" (p. vii). He refers enthusiastically to a forthcoming work of a member of the École Française de Rome, M. F. Eugène Martin-Chabot: *Nicolas V., Charles VII. et la Pragmatique Sanction: Essai sur le Régime des Bénéfices Ecclésiastiques de France de 1447 à 1455*. But it is devoutly to be wished that the narrow stipend allowed by the French government for publication of the dissertations of students of the École des Chartes and the École des Hautes Études may soon be increased. In 1897 M. Henri Chassériaud sustained a thesis entitled *Étude sur la Pragmatique Sanction sous le Règne de Louis XI.*, and in 1902 M. Robert Huard followed with a brilliant study upon *La Régence du Duc de Bedford à Paris de 1422 à 1435* (see *Positions des Thèses de l'École Nationale des Chartes*, 1897, 1902). Both these dissertations are still unprinted.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Lectures on Modern History. By the late Right Hon. JOHN EMERICH EDWARD, First Baron ACTON. Edited with an introduction by JOHN NEVILLE FIGGIS, M.A., and REGINALD VERE LAURENCE, M.A. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906. Pp. xix, 362.)

THIS volume of lectures "together with that forthcoming on the French Revolution will form the chief though not the only monument"

of the activity of the late Lord Acton as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. The first lecture is Lord Acton's inaugural address "On the Study of History", delivered June 11, 1895, and published the following year. Then follow nineteen brief lectures on modern history from "The Beginning of the Modern State" and "The New World" to the ten pages on "The American Revolution" (from 1763 to 1787). These lectures give a brief survey of the leading movements and personalities between 1300 and 1787. Two appendixes give Lord Acton's directions to the contributors to the *Cambridge Modern History* and the notes and references on which he based his inaugural lecture. With the exception of the chapters on "Calvin and Henry VIII.", "The Rise of the Whigs", and "The Hanoverian Settlement", the chapter-titles are those used in all general histories. Indeed it is in some ways the best text-book for a college class in general European history to 1789 yet published.

Two productions in the book are well worth including: the inaugural lecture with the citations and quotations with which Lord Acton fortified his views, and the directions to the editors of the *Cambridge Modern History*. The inaugural "On the Study of History", which is already familiar to historical students, is many things in one. It is a plea for the study of history as a search for truth, a quest for the permanent and abiding, for a mastery of the past that we may know the present, yes, even the future as Pitt and Mirabeau and Mallet du Pan knew it. It is a plea for history that makes us wiser without our producing books, for the cultivation of historical-mindedness. It puts religion as the first of human concerns and the mother of freedom and toleration—a condition which through the delayed but unarrested development of the Reformation has put Protestant countries in the van of progress.

The address is rich in things not here mentioned and is worth re-reading. Indeed it demands it, for Lord Acton's method of presenting a thought is like that of a great mathematician whose mind leaps from major equation to major equation and leaves you to toil through the intermediate operations that to him were self-evident. Occasionally his subtlety approaches downright obscurity. The notes and citations show the Lord Acton of whose appalling breadth of reading one hears. In the fortification of twenty-eight pages of the text easily over two hundred writers are cited, several of them a half-dozen times from almost as many different productions. The regrettable part is the picture all this calls up of Lord Acton gathering these excerpts to fortify a suggestion which he had already transmuted into the better metal of his own thought.

The instructions to contributors to the *Cambridge Modern History* form a worthy memorial of Lord Acton's ideals as a historian. He wanted a "Universal History—which is distinct from the combined history of all countries, which is not a rope of sand, but a continuous development; and is not a burden on the memory, but an illumination of

the soul." Such a history was to be written by the best men obtainable, and so written as to serve no cause but that of truth. Nothing of personal, national, religious, or party bias was to show in this summary of the most recent scholarship for layman and student.

The lectures on European history will be read with interest by the specialist in any period between 1300 and 1789 and by the tyro of the historical department who is teaching the introductory course. The specialist will find in a sentence a flash of light that illumines his field, that unifies the complex, and gives meaning to the meaningless. He will find curious bits of out-of-the-way information that even his research has not unearthed, or, if it has, that he has not thought of using (*cf.* p. 257). He will marvel that Lord Acton sees only a fourteenth-century Renaissance unrelated to the accomplishments of the two preceding centuries, and that a sketch of the rise of Prussia occupies only one-third as much as the chapter on Frederick the Great. Most of us will be comforted by the fact that when Lord Acton had to put Luther, the Counter-Reformation, the Thirty Years' War, or Louis XIV. into one lecture, he said what we have always thought a college class ought to be told. And like every compressed account there are statements which would mislead you if this were the only account you read (*cf.* the method of adopting the Declaration of Independence, p. 312). Occasionally there are paragraphs packed dangerously full of names and facts. To some students these may be, as the editors suggest, an inspiration to further reading. There is an equally large class of students who would be repelled by such general history. Possibly this feature of the master's work would not strike one if he had not been antagonized by its manifestations in his disciples.

Finest and best of all is the noble and ennobling fairness in his treatment of all men and all ages. The young man to whom the doors of Cambridge were closed because of his faith comes back at sixty to tell her sons the story of Modern Europe so that they must have felt as he did that the greatest achievement of those centuries was the growth of toleration and of liberty. And the voice that speaks is not that of the moralist nor the political reformer, but the voice of History itself.

To all who sat under Lord Acton this publication will come as "an act of piety". To many it will only emphasize the defect in Lord Acton which the editors point out, "that he overestimated the responsibility of his task, and that, with him as with Hort, the very sense of the value of knowledge diminished his additions to its store." G. S. F.

The Golden Days of the Renaissance in Rome. From the Pontificate of Julius II to that of Paul III. By RODOLFO LANCIANI. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company. 1906. Pp. xii, 340.)

Nor long since there still could be seen in the Via Rasella an inscription which spoke volumes regarding the state of Rome in the

period when the popes were resident at Avignon. It preserved the tradition that where the tablet stood a wolf had once been killed—and this in the very heart of the city. By 1377, when Gregory XI. left the banks of the Rhone for the Lateran, the population had sunk to 17,000. Such, at least, is Cancellieri's estimate of those who dwelt within the walls of Aurelian, and Papencordt's figures are but a little higher. Other particulars still more distressful will be found by the curious in Menacacci's *L'Italia senza il Papa*.

On the title-page Lanciani defines his "Golden Days of the Renaissance" as extending from Julius II. to Paul III., but in reality he begins at the sad and ruinous period of the Great Schism. The fact is worth mentioning since by a glance cast backward to the last years of the fourteenth century he secures a useful standard of contrast. One not unreasonably might expect that in a book so called and beginning with Urban VI., pontiffs like Martin V., Nicholas V., and Sixtus IV. would receive much notice, and indeed all three are used to register certain stages of advance. But Lanciani's real enthusiasm is reserved for Paul III. "The memory of this great pontiff", he says, "will always be dear to us Romans. Pomponio Leto, his preceptor, had imbued him with the spirit of humanism, and imparted to him the gift of a gay and bright conversation. He seemed to have brought back with his advent to the pontificate the fine old days of Leo X, with a higher standard of morals" (pp. 143-144).

In 1534, when Alessandro Farnese became the successor of Clement VII., there had been no Roman pope for over a hundred years, and popular rejoicing at his election was unexampled. He rewarded the devotion of his townsfolk by transforming into a modern capital the city which Bourbon's troops had just sacked. Here we have Lanciani's central theme—the co-operation of Paul III. and Latino Mannetti in the rebuilding of Rome. No other pontiff is made the subject of a whole chapter, though this compliment is paid to Michelangelo, Vittoria Colonna, Raphael, and Agostino Chigi. The rest of the volume falls under two main heads: an account of the city, which is largely topographical, and a very interesting study of social life in Rome during the Cinque-cento.

From this brief statement regarding contents we hasten on to say a word about the method of treatment which Lanciani adopts in the present volume. His great love of topography and archaeological detail leads him somewhat to overburden his pages with the minutiae of scholarship. Otherwise his arrangement is excellent. Writing for those who are not specialists, he is orderly without being rigorous. Where he wishes to introduce a little excursus he does so, and the digression is justified by its intrinsic interest. One of the subjects which he introduces to save his text from becoming overloaded with the names of buildings is that of Raphael's relations with La Fornarina, and in his chapter on Vittoria Colonna he turns aside to vindicate

Dante from the charge of being a precursor of the Reformation. For the historian the most notable feature of the work is Lanciani's thorough-paced admiration of Paul III., despite the excessive devotion of that pontiff to the interests of Pier Luigi, and the tortuous politics of his career. "It was not easy", says Ranke, "for a man to be sure of the terms on which he stood with Pope Paul." But with Lanciani his sagacity and the splendor of his ambitions for Rome outweigh everything else.

A few slips in dates which we have observed may be due to oversight on the part of the proof-reader, but inconsistency in giving the modern equivalent for sums of money can hardly be due to that cause. In general there is good reason to speak well of the book. Lanciani not only reduces to form and order a great farrago of archaeological information, but he has succeeded in marshalling facts which illustrate important aspects of Roman life. For example, he places in high relief the cosmopolitan tone of society, and marks with perfect clearness the stages by which Rome passed from its medieval to its modern condition. His character-sketches are somewhat external in approach, but do not lack passages which reveal critical insight.

A History of the Inquisition of Spain. By HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D. In four volumes. Volume III. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1907. Pp. xi, 575.)

IN January, promptly to the month, appeared Mr. Lea's third volume. Its first two chapters, on "Torture" and "The Trial", complete his study of the practice of the Inquisition; five others, beginning with "The Sentence" and ending with "The Auto de Fe", cover what he has to tell us of its punishments; and the closing four, on "Jews", "Moriscos", "Protestantism", and "Censorship", open that survey of its spheres of action which is to fill also most of his final volume, due in June.

Though, "from the middle of the thirteenth century, the habitual employment of torture by the Holy Office had been the most efficient factor in spreading its use throughout Christendom", and though the Spanish Inquisition continued to employ it, Mr. Lea (and it will be remembered that he is the most eminent student of the history of torture) assures us (p. 2) that "the popular impression that the inquisitorial torture-chamber was the scene of exceptional refinement in cruelty, of specially ingenious modes of inflicting agony, and of peculiar persistence in extorting confessions, is an error due to sensational writers who have exploited credulity." "As a rule," he says, the Spanish Inquisition "was less cruel than the secular courts in its application, and confined itself more strictly to a few well-known methods"; and "the comparison between the Spanish and the Roman Inquisition is also eminently in favor of the former." Let it not be inferred,

however, that even with the Spanish Inquisition torture was rare or light; and strong must be the nerves of the reader who can follow Mr. Lea through his recital of its horrors.

In general, sums up the historian (p. 36), "the procedure of the Inquisition was directed to procuring conviction rather than justice." "It was the business of the tribunal, while preserving outward forms of justice, to bring about either confession or conviction; the defence was limited and embarrassed in every way and, when the outcome of all this was doubt, it was settled in the torture-chamber, always with the reservation that, if suspicion remained, that in itself was a crime deserving due punishment."

As to its punishments Mr. Lea points out (p. 93) an important difference from the secular courts. "The Inquisition had full discretion and was bound by no rules. It was the only tribunal known to the civilized world which prescribed penalties and modified them at its will." For stubborn and impenitent heresy, of course, the penalty was the stake and confiscation; but these were penalties prescribed by the state, to which the heretic must be turned over for condemnation and execution. "This shifting of responsibility to the civil power", Mr. Lea finds it wise again to remind us (p. 184), "was not through any sense that the laws punishing heresy with burning were cruel or unjust." On the contrary, "the Church taught this to be an act so eminently pious that it accorded an indulgence to any one who would contribute wood to the pile", and "the secular power had no choice as to what it should do with heretics delivered to it; its act was purely ministerial, and if it listened to the hypocritical plea for mercy, it was liable to prosecution as a fautor of heresy and to deprivation of its functions." Indeed, "in the hurried informality of the early period, it seems to have been indifferent whether the magistrate pronounced a sentence or not"; and, in general, "the Inquisition regarded the sentence of the magistrate as a mere perfunctory formality."

In the extermination of heresy Mr. Lea finds the methods of the Spanish Inquisition more merciless than those of its medieval predecessor. Not only the frankly impenitent heretic and the penitent who relapsed into his heresy must be sent to the stake, but the *negativo*, who denied a heresy which the Inquisition deemed proved against him, and the *diminuto*, who confessed to less than the evidence seemed to demand. As these, were they really heretics, could have no object in persisting in denial after the sentence had once been pronounced, and as this persistence robbed them both of the final consolations of religion and of the merciful strangulation which might else have preceded their burning, it is impossible, as Mr. Lea points out (p. 198), not to recognize in them martyrs of orthodoxy; but such little incidents were far better than the escape of a possible heretic. Indeed, when the advent of Protestantism deepened the fear and hatred of heresy, yet sharper measures were demanded. Not even recantation could longer save the disseminator of heresy from the stake, and relapse need not be waited

for. Pope Paul IV., who in 1555 "had apparently desired to show that Rome was not to be outdone by Geneva in persecuting rigor and that, if Calvin in 1553 had burnt Servet for denying the Trinity, he could be equally zealous for the faith," and had decreed by a general bull that "all who denied the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, his conception through the Holy Ghost, his death for human salvation, or the perpetual virginity of the Virgin, and who did not confess to inquisitors and abjure their errors within three months, and all who in future should maintain those heresies," should forthwith suffer the penalty of relapsed heretics, bestowed in 1559 on the Spanish Inquisition the further power of dealing thus with all heretics counted dangerous or insincere.

Yet Mr. Lea is inclined to think the importance of the Protestant movement in Spain to have been greatly exaggerated. "There never," he says (p. 411), "was the slightest real danger that Protestantism could make such permanent impression on the profound and unreasoning religious convictions of Spain in the sixteenth century, as to cause disturbance in the body politic; and the excitement created in Valladolid and Seville, in 1558 and 1559, was a mere passing episode leaving no trace in popular beliefs." But it "raised [the Inquisition] to new life and importance and gave it a claim on the gratitude of the State, which enabled it to dominate the land during the seventeenth century"; and it "served as a reason for isolating Spain from the rest of Europe, excluding all foreign ideas, arresting the development of culture and of science, and prolonging medievalism into modern times". Something similar might doubtless be said of the influence of heresy as a whole; for to the end, as the documents appended to this volume abundantly prove, heresy properly so called played but a minor and a dwindling part in the actual business of the Inquisition.

GEORGE L. BURR.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late LORD ACTON, LL.D. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Volume IV. *The Thirty Years' War.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1906. Pp. xxix, 1003.)

It may well seem unnecessary to discuss further the general plan and character of the *Cambridge Modern History*. But before proceeding to the examination of this latest volume from the standpoint of the editorial plans and the standards set by the preceding issues, the present reviewer would like to express his belief that the tendency heretofore strongly shown to use this work as an argument against co-operative undertakings in the field of history has gone a little too far, and that the criticism of the editorial supervision has been at times too exacting. With regard to the judgment of co-operative undertakings it is perhaps worth recalling that there are at least two leading sorts, and that the sort to which the Cambridge work belongs is to be sharply distinguished

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII.—41.

from the class of "Einzeldarstellungen" of which the "Oncken" and the "American Nation" series are the best-known examples. In this latter class each author is put practically in possession of a comparatively distinct field and works under but slightly different conditions than if he were publishing in entire independence; it is a form that would seem capable of effective use even in limited fields with regard to *Kulturgeschichte*. The other class is that to which the present series belongs and of which before it the *Histoire Générale* of Lavissee and Rambaud was the chief example; here the writers really more or less collaborate in limited periods, each furnishing but a spoke of the wheel, presenting as a specialist but a small section of the results of studies presumably covering more or less the whole period. Thus it might be hoped, not only would there be secured for each section the great weight of greater specialization, but there would be also focussed on the whole period or on the main movements in it illumination from different quarters and elevations. With regard to undertakings of this kind the reviewer is inclined to think that too much is looked for usually from the editorial supervision. The work must of course be carefully planned and apportioned, dovetailed in some degree; but why should there be great objection to a reasonable amount of iteration or to the appearance of differing and even conflicting views? It may be contended that the editor who ruthlessly excludes such duplicating statements or who strives to harmonize conclusions or even statements of fact will really mutilate and emasculate. The space saved will be but slight; and the reader who needs to be preserved from the terrible danger of being confronted within the same covers with differing views or even different statements of fact has probably too frail an intellectual existence to be at large at all in the rarefied atmosphere of specialization. The work of the specialist under such conditions is at best irritating and unsatisfactory; it becomes the more so with rigorous editorial efforts to secure an impossible (and probably undesirable) "unity."

The present reviewer, then, while strongly deploring the very apparent limitations in the views and plans of the editors of the *Cambridge Modern History*, is not wholly in accord with some of the complaints against earlier volumes of their work. And it seems to him further that the chances of usefulness of these volumes have not been sufficiently recognized. Even the expert in this or that period may find these brief and usually very meaty statements useful in bringing together conveniently the methods and conclusions of other experts; the real student who is not an expert can see readily what stage has been reached in the knowledge of the period and will welcome the variety of standpoints and opinions. From the point of view of the general reader or the elementary student the paucity of trustworthy work in English must be kept in mind; certainly these volumes will be of great use to the university teacher in modern history, while the serious general reader cannot easily be directed to more satisfactory political or military narratives.

The present volume deals with a period of unusual vigor and complexity of entanglements—a period then peculiarly ill-adapted to successful co-operative treatment. The space assigned is liberal, 799 pages being given to the period 1610–1660. This is nearly double that given in the *Histoire Générale*; but as there is considerable divergence in the plans of volume and topic division, it is not easy to compare the two works directly. The *Histoire Générale* list of topics seems at first glance the more comprehensive, but this is due mainly to the different lines of division. Thus the *Cambridge History* gives absolutely no space in this volume to Eastern Europe (to which volume V. of the *Histoire Générale* gives four chapters); on the other hand there are here two excellent chapters on Scandinavia, a field that is deferred by the *Histoire Générale* to the volume on the age of Louis XIV. A disproportionate amount of space we are prepared to find assigned in the *Cambridge* volume to British conditions (250 pp.); we should not complain if it were not for the inclusion of one entirely superfluous chapter (Mr. Clutton-Brock's "The Fantastic School of English Poetry", dealing with the age of Donne and Herbert). *Kulturgeschichte* fares rather badly in both works; but while the general treatment of Art and Science in the *Histoire Générale* may seem to promise more, Professor Boutroux's chapter in the *Cambridge* on "Descartes and Cartesianism" is both better in itself and more in line with the plan of treatment. As to method and style, the French work maintains a clear superiority, most of the sections in the English being below its average in clarity, attractiveness, and sense of proportion. The greater bulk of the present volume is due to the almost unrestrained yielding to the tendency to encyclopedic detail that has marked the whole undertaking; whether designed or not, there can be no doubt that the editors secure a painful uniformity in this respect at least. There is evidently no chance of reform on the point; but we need not therefore shut our eyes to the fact that encyclopedic detail is often very useful, and that in almost every case these dry and close-packed pages are marked by a high degree of accuracy and scholarly grasp.

The chief section of the book is constituted by Professor Ward's able treatment of the war as a whole, in its narrower sense; thorough as is the writer's grasp of the field, he has little gift of narration, leaves no vivid impressions of either men or events, and casts no new light on problems. The closing chapter, "The Peace of Westphalia", is however in all likelihood the best statement to be found in our language of the development and the results of the long negotiations. Next in importance (slightly larger in space) comes the section devoted to Great Britain and Ireland, 1625–1660; Dr. Prothero, an acknowledged master in the field, does the most of it, and is ably helped by W. A. Shaw, J. R. Tanner, Hume Brown, R. Dunlop, and C. H. Firth. While we may perhaps be surprised that this part of the broth should have required so many cooks, we cannot cavil much at the carrying on of the collabora-

tion. It would seem also as if the comparatively slight connections with continental events were more carefully and skilfully presented than is usually the case. France falls to the third editor, Mr. Leathes, who on the whole makes a strikingly good use of the limited seventy pages assigned; he is more successful in his treatment of detail than most of his associates, and is both clear and suggestive. A striking feature of his statement is his adverse judgment of Richelieu, whose title to greatness is strongly questioned. He is denied "creative and beneficent statesmanship", and is credited with establishing a "lawless despotism" that brings on the Revolution; he had never comprehended the "true bases of national prosperity", and "had revealed to the French monarchy the weakness of all those traditional and conventional restraints which had limited the power of earlier Kings for good, and more especially for evil" (p. 157).

Interspersed between the sections of these main studies come the chapters dealing with minor fields. First there is the uneven treatment by H. F. Brown of "The Valtelline". This is absurdly detailed in the first part of the period and scanty in the later; Mr. Brown's ingenious defense of his detail on the ground of the reflection by the Valtelline factions of the policies and efforts of the great states is decidedly weakened by his admission that most of the complexity was caused by the efforts of these factions to sell out to the highest bidder. A similar war of factions seems to be responsible for most of the detail in which Mr. Reddaway luxuriates in the first part of his treatment of Scandinavia; from the accession of Gustavus Adolphus, however, the work is remarkably good. Mr. Hume's chapter on Spain is of course excellent, notwithstanding its rather naïve display of the "inédit" and its neglect of the Spanish contributions to the war in Germany (not dealt with by Ward). The presentation of the Papal policy by Brosch brings out clearly the controlling motives, but is likely to be criticized for a somewhat too pronounced Protestant tone, as in the statement that with the success of the Catholic Powers 1627-1629 "the whole of modern civilisation and the continuous development of learning would have been forcibly stopped, and that for no short time" (p. 677). Mr. Edmundson's Holland is excellent; he is to be given the credit of being almost the only contributor who gives adequate attention to intellectual conditions, even though we may suspect him of going too far in ascribing to the Dutch in this their Golden Age "a supremacy in the domains of science, of learning, of letters, and of the arts, as indisputable as their supremacy upon the seas" (p. 716). The treatment of colonial development by Egerton is much too detailed and is injured by too rigorous keeping within the prescribed time limits. The closing chapter by Boutroux on Descartes has been already mentioned; it leaves us with an increased regret that the writers did not see fit to sacrifice some of the political and military detail in order to secure room for other things.

The bibliography appended to this volume is much more extensive

than in any of the others (pp. 801-953); this we are told by the editors is exceptional and is due to an intention to do honor to Lord Acton by utilizing the collection of his books presented by Mr. Carnegie to John Morley and by Mr. Morley to Cambridge University in compiling "a full bibliography of the Thirty Years' War, and more especially of its extant original documents and contemporary narrative and controversial literature". Only the specialist can venture to criticize this effort. But it naturally suggests the thought that the editors in the bibliographies of the other volumes seem to be occupying rather untenable ground in giving more than the average student needs and not enough for the specialist.

VICTOR COFFIN.

English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act: The Parish and the County. By SIDNEY and BEATRICE WEBB. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1906. Pp. xxv, 664.)

At last the local constitutional history of England is receiving the treatment which it deserves as compared with the history of the national organization. This book is epoch-making. The completed work as planned by the authors will constitute a veritable *magnum opus* both in scope and in quality, to judge by this splendid installment. It is to comprise at least five volumes, grouped in two general divisions. The first division, in three volumes, deals with the "constitutional form and the administrative procedure of the various kinds of local governing authorities"; and the second, in two volumes, with "the action of all these authorities in respect to the various functions entrusted to Local Government." Hitherto the attention of original investigators has been confined mainly to the Anglo-Saxon and early feudal periods of English local institutions. Regarding some of the more important problems of the early history, in articles, monographs, and in books dealing with the national constitution, much good work has already been accomplished. Even for those times, however, there exists no authoritative or sustained "local constitutional history" based on a full use of the sources; while for the modern development the only general treatise has been Dr. H. Rudolph von Gneist's *Selfgovernment, Communalverfassung und Verwaltungsgeschichte*, first published in 1857 and finally revised in 1871. It is highly significant of the extreme indifference of English scholars to one of the richest fields of research that this important book has found no translator. Yet, able and erudite as is Gneist's celebrated work, in reality it is merely a legal history based mainly on the public statutes and parliamentary papers. Little use has been made of the private acts and none at all of the manuscript records of the various administrative and governing bodies.

The present volume represents an enormous amount of labor. With the aid of a number of trained assistants, the authors were engaged upon

it for eight years. One is deeply impressed by the bewildering variety and mass of the original materials which have been exploited. The foot-notes alone are a perfect mine of information, supplementing the narrative in many ways. The manuscript sources employed comprise the original minutes of the parish vestries and the primitive records of many other governing bodies. Among the printed materials drawn upon are the contemporary local newspapers, "which give flesh and blood to the skeleton provided by the official minutes"; contemporary pamphlets, especially those which are controversial in character; the correspondence and decisions of the various branches of the national government, such as the privy council, the treasury, and the secretary of state's office; the journals of the Lords and the Commons; and the thousands of private statutes usually neglected by investigators.

All this wealth of materials has been used with masterly thoroughness and skill. The volume is divided into two books: the first, in seven chapters and an "Introduction" dealing with the "Parish"; and the second, in six chapters with a similar "Introduction" devoted to the "County". During the period under consideration the parish, measured by the extent and variety of its functions, was by far the most important local institution. Throughout England and Wales it was "ubiquitous"; while the county justices, "who elsewhere exercised so dominating an influence, were jealously excluded from towns which had secured the privilege of government by their own corporate magistracy". Exclusive of the parishes and the manors, all the other local governing authorities did not amount to two thousand. On the other hand, in 1835 there existed "no fewer than 15,634 parishes or places separately relieving their own paupers".

The first chapter is devoted to an enlightening discussion of the many hard questions connected with "The Legal Framework of the Parish"; for everywhere the investigator is confronted with uncertainty and complexity. In 1689 the parishes of England presented every conceivable variety in size, shape, and population. Until after the age of Elizabeth the constable was treated by Parliament as the first officer in the parish. Yet the authors have shown that the notion, derived from writers like Selden, that the constable was the constitutive officer of the parish is not sustained by the evidence. Originally an officer of the manorial court leet, he was never formally transferred to the parish; and when in the seventeenth century in many districts the courts leet fell into decay, the appointment of the constable passed to the county justices. "Whether in the north or in the south, chosen at the court leet or appointed by the quarter or petty sessions, the constable was in all historic times pre-eminently the justices' man". At any rate, after 1689, and probably before, the churchwardens were the real heads of the parish.

Perhaps no chapter in the book is more instructive than the second, dealing with "Unorganized Parish Government". In the rural parishes, an oligarchy held full sway; and the multifarious duties of the

so-called "vestry" were often performed by the clergyman and a few land-owning farmers, without formal procedure, "rigid adherence to law", or "outside supervision". In the more "compact and peaceful parishes", government by consent was more pronounced. The oligarchy grew into an "open vestry". By the close of the eighteenth century, the "uncontrolled" offices of many parishes near London and in the "unincorporated mining and manufacturing districts of the northern and midland counties" were often corrupt and grossly inefficient. "Graft" prevailed; and in at least one parish, Bethnal Green, there was a striking example of "boss rule" anticipating the most pronounced American type.

In the remaining chapters of book I., the "Extra-Legal Democracy", the "Strangling of the Parish", the "Legality of the Close Vestry", the "Close Vestry Administration", and the "Reform of the Close Vestry" are considered. Here, as throughout the remarkable chapters devoted to the county in book II., there is a minuteness of exact detail, a wealth of documentary illustration, a constant disclosure of truth, a conscientious refutation of popular error, a rich flavor of originality, which only a patient delving in the almost inexhaustible mine of source-materials could produce. This volume can only be the fruit of a zealous devotion to science for its own sake; and the sympathetic student will eagerly await the successful completion of the great task which the courageous authors have set themselves.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

Deutsche Geschichte. VON KARL LAMPRECHT. Der ganzen Reihe achter Band. Dritte Abteilung. *Neueste Zeit. Zeitalter des subjektiven Seelenlebens.* Erster Band. Erste und zweite Hälfte. (Freiburg im Breisgau: H. Heyfelder. 1906. Pp. viii, 729.)

LAMPRECHT'S *Deutsche Geschichte* aims to give an analysis on a psychological basis of the various periods of the cultural life of Germany. This, the first volume of the third section, which is to treat of "Neueste Zeit", covers the period from about 1750 to about the beginning of the nineteenth century, with the exclusion of the Romantic Movement. The distinguished feature of Lamprecht's work lies in his belief in a national psyche ("Volkseele") which develops according to immanent, transcendental laws, and—however affected by outside influences—in all essentials remains true to itself. We have here a conception of history akin to that of Herder.

In the "Einleitung" (pp. 3-90) Lamprecht reviews the temperament of the periods preceding the one now under treatment. After the restrictions of the Middle Ages, the "Individualistische Zeitalter" (about 1500-1750) freed the personality of man, but made of him an isolated individual, not conceived as acting upon, or influenced by his environment, "ein aus sich selbst nur lebender Mikrokosmos" (p. 5.). In the "subjektivistische Zeitalter" the individual, though becoming

more and more self-important, grows increasingly conscious of the interdependence between himself and his environment.

Chapter I. (pp. 93-179), "Entstehung und erste Entwicklungsperiode des modernen Bürgertums", shows how the old "Bürgertum" which in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and early part of the sixteenth centuries had molded the culture of Germany (mainly in the free cities of the south) decayed. Then through various influences, especially the rise of Brandenburg-Prussia and the great influx of Huguenots after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the whole centre of gravity of the political and social life moved northward, from Nürnberg and Augsburg to Hamburg, Leipzig, and Berlin.

Chapter II. (pp. 180-302), "Neue Gesellschaft, neues Seelenleben", describes the increasing prosperity of the new "Bürgertum", which from about 1740 on led to a widening of the horizon and to a consequent desire for a new culture adapted to its own needs. The fact that the leaders of the new intellectual life sprang from this class (Winckelmann, Herder, Goethe, Schiller, Kant, Fichte, etc.) proves its significance. Simplicity, in contrast to the aristocratic standards of the preceding generation, would very naturally be the new ideal. Thus the author insists that the cult of the simple and the emotional in Germany was an indigenous growth. Although Lamprecht may go too far in undervaluing the importance of the influence of Rousseau and English writers like Addison and Thomson, we heartily agree with his protest against that mechanical explanation of all phenomena as the result of literary influence from without (pp. 250 *et seqq.*).

This class, though essentially commercial, by no means aimed solely at the acquisition of money. It was, on the contrary, animated by a genuine desire for a higher intellectual life; its instincts, however, being for some time literary only, not artistic or political. This discussion helps one to understand the ideals of Wilhelm Meister. In the course of a few decades the public—and not the princes as of yore—became the patrons of letters (p. 210). The old nobility thus dropped behind and its literature decayed (p. 224). Here we miss a mention of Wieland (whom Lamprecht does not adequately appreciate, as appears in his characterization, pp. 437 *et seqq.*) as the one German writer of the period who, because of his French form, influenced the aristocracy. This middle class, stimulated by many new influences, as we saw, passes through a phase of exaggerated emotionality. The next pages (230-250) are devoted to tracing the growth and waning of this sentimentality, which on the one hand produced great originality, on the other many phenomena tending to pathology, such as intense introspection, violent enthusiasm, weakening of the will. Here a few words on Wieland's novel *Agathon* (1766/7), an expression of intense introspection on the part of the author, would have been illuminating. Another helpful reflex of the psychic conditions could have been adduced from contemporary "travels" (especially from Heinse).

About 1780 came the ebbing of the new sentimentality and excite-

ment. The teaching of men like Lichtenberg, Lessing, Kant, gained in influence. This is the foundation of the classical period. Important in the rest of the chapter is the treatment of the age's growth of feeling for external nature, from sentimental delight in her pensive beauties to intense enjoyment of her grandeur and an almost morbid vivification ("Beseelung"). Next, the author traces the emotional intensification of religious, ethical, and pedagogical ideals after the aridness of the age of individualism. Toward the end of the century, however, increasing emphasis is laid on the training of the will.

Chapter III. (pp. 313-409), "Neue Weltanschauung", deals with the rise of the earliest "subjektivistisch" psychology. Then follows a discussion of the various attempts of the age to solve the world-riddle, first through Pantheism and the cult of Spinoza's philosophy (Herder), then by means of epistemology, culminating in the subjectivity of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781). But the transcendentalism of the "Practical Reason" with its "Categorical Imperative" made of Kant a severe moral teacher very aptly compared to Luther. Lamprecht then contrasts with Kant's method that of Goethe, as that of the scientific investigator turning primarily to external nature. Yet Goethe, too, an exponent of a subjective age, recognized the limit of human reason, and postulated a Power within the phenomenon discernible only through intuition. In this presentation we hear the echoes of the numerous discussions on Goethe which during the last decades have thrown floods of light on him as a scientist and thinker (Kalischer, Harnack, Steiner, Siebeck, etc.). Lamprecht rightly concludes that Kant merely matured and did not create Schiller's ethical and esthetic principles. Like Goethe and Kant, Schiller insists on controlled emotions.

In chapter IV. (pp. 409-567), "Neue Dichtung", Lamprecht traces the manifestations of the new psyche from the early sentimental poetry of Klopstock through the wild chaos of the "Sturm und Drang" (here introducing some interesting remarks on the change in the conception of fate during that period) to the "innere Bindung zum Klassizismus." There is here nothing especially new, but the entire evolution of German literature is viewed in a new light.

Chapter V. (pp. 568-704), "Bildende Kunst und Musik", deals in the same fashion with the evolution of art and music. Here a word on the development of art-criticism—the change from "Kunstverstand" to "Kunstgefühl" (Menges, K.Ph. Moritz, Heinse)—would have been illuminating. Moreover, the author's condemnation of the influence of antiquity as pernicious to the growth of originality in the creative arts seems exaggerated. For, had Germany been as powerful in this respect as she was in literature and music, Greek beauty would here also have proved only a salutary discipline.

The rich and suggestive contents of this book are not uniformly presented in satisfactory style. At times the author, in his anxiety to go to the cause beyond the phenomenon, is not sufficiently concrete in his presentation (cf. "Einleitung", also pp. 466, 585, etc.). Here and

there important ideas are obscured by unskilful language (pp. 40, 590, etc.). In many other places, however, his style rises to remarkable adequacy, originality, and force. This is true in his treatment of the personalities of Kant (pp. 357 *et seqq.*), Beethoven (pp. 683 *et seqq.*), in his delineation of the position of Thuringia in the culture-life of Germany (pp. 503 *et seqq.*), in the sketching of large movements in a few words (pp. 583 *et seqq.*, 598 *et seqq.*, 623 *et seqq.*, etc.). In conclusion we may say that this work with its original point of view, based on enviable knowledge, will prove stimulating and maturing to all interested in the cultural development of the eighteenth century, from whatever point of view.

CAMILLO VON KLENZE.

Essai sur l'Histoire de la Révolution à Verdun (1789-1795). Par EDMOND PIONNIER, Professeur d'Histoire au Collège de Verdun. (Nancy: A. Crépin-Leblond. 1905. 1p. xix, 565, cxxxviii.)

THIS is an excellent local history of the useful type which Professor Aulard has been urging upon the younger school of French historical students. The author presented it at the University of Nancy as his thesis for the Doctorate of Letters. He has renounced all effort to produce literary effects and has sought to exhibit, in detail and with abundant analysis of documents, a special development of a great national movement. The student of the Revolution will find either in his narrative or in the appendixes and *pièces justificatives* a mass of instructive illustrative material. Some of this is unique, because Verdun was almost the only town of importance which was occupied by the Prussians during the invasion of 1792. The short time which had elapsed since the overthrow of the king made the position of the royalists very delicate. The Duke of Brunswick understood this, and assured the officials, in his first summons to surrender, that the armies under his command were engaged solely in vindicating the authority of the king and that no conquests would be made. The faint-hearted and reluctant defense of the town was the beginning there of the tragedy of the Revolution, for the people seem to have passed through the earlier crises without suffering any harm more serious than violent speechmaking or pamphleteering.

The only phase of the Revolution upon which M. Pionnier does not dwell at some length is the development of the economic or industrial situation. The question of subsistence interests him, and he gives several pages to the varying cost of wheat or bread, and to the enforcement, in these particulars, of the maximum legislation. Among other phases illustrated in the experience of Verdun is the municipal revolution. At first nothing more serious happened than the destruction of the barriers, preventing the collection of the octroi from July 25 to October 14. A "permanent committee" was appointed, although not until the middle of August, and this committee did not, as in Paris, supersede the old municipality. The organization of a national guard was all that was distinctively new.

Still more interesting are the illustrations of the church question. The bishop of Verdun was in the ecclesiastical province of the archbishop of Trèves. When the news of the abolitions of August 4 came, the clergy protested on the ground of the stipulations of Westphalia. To the details of the sale of church property M. Pionnier has devoted a long appendix. Apropos of the Worship of Reason affair, he gives a list of the statues, pictures, and other objects destroyed at the cathedral, November 28, 1793, in the presence of the "pontife" (the Constitutional bishop, Aubry) and his clergy, who abjured their titles and renounced "charlatanerie". It is unnecessary to add that on this occasion the countenances of the "sansculottes" were "suffused with joy", as they also were, six months later, when the new cult was degraded to give place to Robespierre's Festival of the Supreme Being.

The portions of the work which touch the Reign of Terror show the Verdunois as "gens de nature fort changeante", to use M. Pionnier's words, and illustrate the fact that the particular use of the Terror was to maintain in power the group of politicians which had seized the reins of government in June and July, 1793. As the persons in Verdun responsible for the surrender to the Prussians in 1792 were not executed until April, 1794, and as for a large part of the intervening time it was doubtful whether their punishment would go beyond temporary imprisonment and political ruin, the final execution had no moral value. The only other executions were of those who expressed sympathy with the proscribed Girondins.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham, 1792-1840. By STUART J. REID. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1906. Two vols., pp. xx, 409; xii, 409.)

JOHN GEORGE LAMBTON, first Earl of Durham, was a paradox, in the sense of Robertson of Brighton's well-known phrase, "my tastes are with the aristocrat, my principles are with the mob." Durham combined genuine radicalism with the ambition, ultimately gratified, of attaining high rank in the British peerage. His career fell at a momentous era in English history. A young man of twenty-three when Waterloo was fought, he played a conspicuous part in the reconstruction in England after the close of the war. From the first Durham opposed the Corn Laws, though he did not live to see their repeal. He fought for a more radical Reform Bill than was ultimately passed, voting by ballot being one of the things which he failed to carry. Had he not gone to the House of Lords, Durham's would undoubtedly have been the honor, which fell to Lord John Russell, of introducing the Bill in the House of Commons. As it was, the Committee of Four which shaped it met at his house and his influence was only short of dominant. His Whig colleagues who wished reform to go so far and no farther never wholly trusted Durham; his nickname of "the Dissenting Minister" shows that he was a difficult colleague, and his disagreements with his Whig father-in-law, the Prime Minister, Lord Grey,

were notorious. Durham retired from the Cabinet in 1833 and never again became a minister. He had some hope of succeeding Lord Grey in the leadership of the party, but he was not regarded as a safe man and Melbourne came to the front. The Whigs dared not ignore Durham, but Melbourne would not have him in the Cabinet. So in 1835 Durham went as ambassador to Russia. This post he resigned in 1837. Just then rebellion in Canada called for a master-mind to study and solve its problems. Urged by Melbourne, Durham went to Canada. He exceeded his powers, was censured at home, and promptly threw up his post and returned to England, where a year and a half later, in 1840, he died. He had long been a sufferer from disease, and the vexatious conclusion of his Canadian mission no doubt preyed upon his mind and hurried his end.

The motto of Durham's family is "*Le jour viendra.*" He died under something like a cloud. The men with whom he worked on equal terms, Grey, and Palmerston, and Melbourne, and Russell, stand prominently before posterity because they were long in the public eye. Durham's figure, conspicuous enough to his contemporaries, has for us been in the background, partly because he died so young. Now Mr. Reid, who has made an almost lifelong study of the subject, throws into clear relief, in these two handsome volumes, the chief aspects of Durham's career. Perhaps his hero needed vindication less than Mr. Reid supposes. It is chiefly with the Reform Bill and the reorganization of Canada that history will associate his name, and the average man knows that in connection with both Durham played a creditable part. Mr. Reid now furnishes much detail. We are glad to have fuller knowledge about so picturesque a personality, but we knew before that Durham was "Radical Jack", dear to the hearts of the working classes in his time; and even in regard to Canada, we knew pretty much all that Mr. Reid now tells us, in spite of his access not only to Durham's papers but also to those of the brilliant Charles Buller, Durham's secretary on the Canadian mission. One result of the long delay in producing an adequate life of Durham is that his age seems far removed from ours. Durham's contemporaries were astounded that he should praise and appeal to the workingman. That the people themselves should judge what was good for them did not please the Whig aristocrats; in the spirit of the benevolent despots of the eighteenth century they wished, like a physician, to prescribe for the people who were expected to take the healing medicine and be thankful. Doctrinaire liberalism they abhorred, and when Durham was leagued with men like Grote, Duncombe, Sir William Molesworth, and Sir Henry Bulwer, Lord Grey's disapproving comment on his relative was: "Lambton has formed bad connections." Whigs of Lord Grey's type long since became Tories, and it is not easy for a present-day Liberal to understand the resentment and suspicion which some of Durham's views excited among the members of his own party. It was Gladstone who made that party really liberal in the sense of trusting the people.

The account of Durham's work in Canada occupies about one-fourth of Mr. Reid's space. When rebellion in Canada came in 1837, concurrently with Queen Victoria's accession to the throne, England was profoundly interested and only to a leading man could the work of conciliation be intrusted. So Durham was made Governor-General of the whole of British North America; he was given besides plenary powers in Lower Canada, where the legislature was suspended; and with great pomp and state he went to Quebec and began his task. Though ill half the time, he worked with great energy, set on foot a multitude of inquiries, adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the French Canadians, and travelled much in the country to see and judge for himself. But in the midst of his activities came the stunning blow which ended his work. Some of the leading French Canadian rebels were in his hands. Technically they were undoubtedly guilty of treason with death as the penalty. If tried, however, before a French jury, they would not be convicted; if before a specially selected jury, there would be a charge that it was packed. Moreover Durham desired wise conciliation, not punishment. So he issued an ordinance banishing the eight principal prisoners to Bermuda under penalty of death if they returned to Canada without permission. The defect of Durham's action was twofold: he condemned men without trial, and he sent them to Bermuda, where he had no jurisdiction. As to the first point, he had been given such great authority that he probably misunderstood its limitations; as to the second, Melbourne's government could easily have aided him, since they had authority in Bermuda. But when Brougham attacked Durham savagely, Melbourne lamely acquiesced and sacrificed him, basely as Mr. Reid thinks. Durham stopped his work, hurried home, occupied himself busily on the long voyage with preparing his report, and died soon after its appearance.

Undoubtedly this report is his greatest achievement. In spite of Durham's hurry and of its many flaws the report remains the charter of Britain's present-day colonial policy, and marks the dawn of a new era. Durham said bluntly that attempts at controlling the colonies from England had failed, that they must be trusted to govern themselves, and that greater liberty would strengthen not weaken the cohesion of the British Empire. In preparing this great state paper he had competent helpers, notably Charles Buller and Edward Gibbon Wakefield, but Mr. Reid repels with some warmth Brougham's charge that to the report Durham contributed only the six letters of his signature. He was, indeed, not the man to use the work of others without retouching and dominating it. To him, one of the chief authors of the Reform Bill, involving the greatest political revolution perhaps that England has ever known, must be attributed the chief place in effecting another revolution which in time will change the conception of the British Empire from that of a mother-land protecting dependent colonies to that of a permanent league of free and equal nations. Assuredly the

man who played so great a part in two such revolutions is worthy of a detailed biography.

If one essays the task of criticizing Mr. Reid one must add that his work is only moderately well done. He lacks conciseness and sometimes lucidity; his matter is not always well arranged, not always pertinent, not always quite accurate. He makes too great a hero of Durham and resents too obviously any unfavorable criticism by his contemporaries. Mr. Reid himself naïvely admits that Durham "was not infallible" (II. 313). But because Greville tells some stories about Durham not free from malice, Mr. Reid calls him an "idle leaves-dropper" (II. 371). Others besides Greville tell similar stories. Creevey, for instance, is piquant on Durham, and calls him "King Jog" because, having £80,000 a year, he said with assumed moderation that £40,000 was a moderate income which one "might jog on with". In spite of Mr. Reid, Durham was something less than sublime. Together with his generous and honest zeal for good government we find a love of display, an arrogant hauteur, and an impatience of contradiction at times so extravagant as to make his sanity seem doubtful. None the less was he a noble character. One story of Mr. Reid's would make all generous spirits love Durham in spite of his faults:

He was dining one night at Lambton Castle with the Countess, and the only other persons in the room were the servants. He spoke unguardedly across the table to his wife, and swept aside her remarks with brusqueness. When the men withdrew she, the gentlest of women, remonstrated. Instantly, Durham, who had not realised the force of his words until that moment, sprang to his feet, rang the bell, and—fearful that his words had already been reported—ordered the whole of the household into the room. He told the astonished servants that he had been momentarily betrayed into hard and unjust words, declared that he was sorry for the fact, and assured them there was one thing they must remember, which was that, if he ever contradicted the Countess again, he had put himself into the wrong, and she was always right. Then, turning to his wife, he apologised to her in their presence and dismissed them. (II. 373.)

Such was Durham, irritable and impulsive, but above all, honest, courageous, and never sparing himself to carry out that to which his sense of duty called him.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe. Edited by his daughter LAURA E. RICHARDS. Volume I. *The Greek Revolution.* With Notes and a Preface by F. B. SANBORN. (Boston: Dana Estes and Company; London: John Lane. 1906. Pp. xix, 419.)

In this volume we have the first installment of the definitive life of Dr. Howe. The editor has done her work well—so well that one could wish more from her own hand. The story of her father's early life she

dismisses all too briefly to take up the Greek letters and journals which, pieced out here and there from Howe's *Sketch of the Greek Revolution*, yield a work almost purely autobiographical. The journals are the chief sources; and there are four of them, running severally from April to December, 1825; November, 1826, to February 16, 1827; July 5 to November 13, 1827; and November 12, 1828, to June, 1829. This leaves three serious gaps: December, 1825, to November, 1826 (Missolonghi); February to July, 1827 (Fall of Athens); and June, 1829, to June, 1830, when he left Greece a free country.

Their cause was at a low ebb when Howe joined the Greeks in the winter of 1824-1825; and his pictures of guerrilla warfare in the Morea, where he first saw service, are extremely realistic. Without discipline or commissariat, in a country exhausted by four years of war, the Greek *guerrillero* lived a hard life which the young surgeon cheerfully shared. Subsisting often on sorrel and snails or on roasted wasps and rarely knowing the luxury of such lodgings as he at times enjoyed in the ancient galleries of Tiryns, he proved as hardy as the best; and if worst come to worst, he even contemplates forming a band of a dozen rough-riding Philhellenes to harass the Turk. But his best service was not in dealing but in binding up wounds. Near Kalamata we presently find him in charge of a rude field-hospital with eighteen wounded men; and next at Grabousi—a fortified rock-islet on the northeast coast of Crete—as surgeon of the unlucky Cretan expedition he is dressing more wounds and performing more operations than might have fallen to his lot in a lifetime at home. From this service he returns to become surgeon to the hospital at Nauplia.

The second journal opens with his "commission from government as Director of the Medical Department in the Fleet"—with the high-sounding title of *archicheiourgos*—all this at twenty-five! Assigned to the *Karteria*, he was brought into close relations with that brave and disinterested Philhellene, Captain Hastings; but his vivid journal of the siege of Athens breaks off abruptly some four months before the capitulation of the Acropolis. This took place on the fifth of June (see Finlay, VI. 222), not May 5, as Mrs. Richards dates it, evidently mistaking Howe's own date in the *Historical Sketch* (p. 425).

On the fall of Athens Howe is induced by the Greek authorities to undertake a mission to America, only postponed while he assists in the distribution of relief then beginning to pour in from this country. In this service he found his permanent vocation to philanthropy; and the third journal, recording his ministrations to the suffering and starving peasantry of Peloponnesus and the islands, could hardly be surpassed in human interest by any chapter in Greek history. The historian's estimate of that service may be read in Finlay (VI. 437). Meantime, the glory of Navarino (October 20, 1827) had blotted out the shame of Athens; and Howe returned home to take up his "first crusade". In five

months he wrote and published his *Sketch of the Greek Revolution*, an offhand work whose vivid autopsy and keen judgments of men and measures give it permanent value; and then went to the people with his cause. "His words kindled like a torch, and wherever his voice was heard, wherever the flash of his presence was seen, people's hearts sprang up in answer." With \$60,000 thus raised he went back to Greece in November, 1828, and began to administer relief on new principles. He would "give it all to the poor, and yet have it remain to be given over and over again". Doing the thing next his hand, he sets the poor Athenian refugees—250 men and 500 women—at work building a mole in the harbor of Aegina; and for four months over 700 beggars were turned into joyful laborers on a public work of real and lasting utility. It was an object-lesson which Greece sadly needed as she needs the like to-day; but Howe looked farther. He asked and obtained a large land grant near Corinth on which he proposed to colonize these homeless exiles and set them in the way of living from the soil. This colony he actually established, and on his return to Greece in 1844 he found a joyful welcome from his protégés; but owing to a long and virulent siege of swamp-fever which interrupted his journal here we have no adequate account of it. Here ends the Greek story, though the editor has added to the volume the record of her father's adventures in the Polish cause and his consequent imprisonment in Berlin.

These journals have waited eighty years to see the light, though full of facts and judgments of high historical value. There was hardly a keener eye on Greek affairs than Howe's; hardly a man of any age who saw so much and interpreted it so well. His incisive judgments of men have in the main stood the test of time. Capodistrias and Kolokotrones, Mavrokordatos and Miaules, Cochrane and Church, Hamilton and Hastings, stand in history much as he painted them for good or ill. Nor had any man a clearer insight into the strength and weakness of the Greek cause and character. His judgments of the Greek people are at times indeed too stern; for he was every inch a disciplinarian, and discipline there was none in a people scattered and peeled by twenty-two centuries of subjection. But he always corrects these harsh judgments; and his lifelong devotion to their cause is his real tribute to their character.

Apart from the historical value of this volume, it takes rank with the very best Greek travels of that day. No better pictures of humble Greek life have ever been drawn than Howe gives us—notably in his rainy days with Father Peter; and his journals at Naxos and Paros are as good as anything we have about those islands.

J. IRVING MANATT.

Scritti Editi e Inediti. Di GIUSEPPE MAZZINI. Edizione Nazionale. Volume I. (Imola: Cooperativa Editrice B. Galcatti. 1906. Pp. xxxiii, 414.)

No other Italian of the nineteenth century has exerted so wide an influence upon his country through his writings as Joseph Mazzini, apostle of freedom and of national unity. His eloquent appeals in the name of patriotism and the religion of duty served more potently than any other force to rouse his countrymen to the repeated acts of heroism and sacrifice from which was born the modern spirit of Italian nationality; while his masterly direction of intricate and tireless conspiracy against oppression was a primary factor in the expulsion of the foreigner and the despot, and in the consummation of Italian unity. It will not therefore be an exaggeration to characterize in anticipation the publication of which the first volume is noted above as the most important single source for the history of Italy during the period of its awakening.

Two important editions of Mazzini's collected works already exist. The first, *Scritti Letterari di un Italiano Vivente*, appeared anonymously in three volumes at Lugano in 1847. The second, *Scritti Editi e Inediti*, which was commenced under Mazzini's own direction in 1861, and was continued first under that of Saffi, then under that of a private Mazzinian commission, covered a period of forty-three years in its publication, and comprises twenty volumes. The last two volumes alone of this edition contain letters, and these come down only to 1837, a mere fragment of Mazzini's vast correspondence, which in its entirety will constitute a chronicle of over forty years of European conspiracy and revolutionary agitation. Other separate and equally fragmentary volumes of his letters have been published at different times by Countess d'Agoult, Cagnacci, Diamilla Muller, Giannelli, Giuriati, Melegari, Mezzatinti, and Ordoño De Rosales.

All of the material of these editions, together with a mass of important uncollected writings and a great quantity of unpublished correspondence, will be contained in the new national edition, which is designed to be complete. It will comprise not less than sixty volumes, of which five will contain literary essays and book-reviews, twenty-five political essays, and thirty correspondence. A commission of ten, appointed by royal decree, has charge of the editing, under the presidency of the minister of public instruction. It is intended to publish four volumes each year, ordering the material chronologically. Mazzini's first published writings were literary, and none of his letters prior to 1831 are known. The first volume therefore contains literary essays and notices. It may be observed, however, that in Mazzini's mind from the first, political and patriotic motives maintained a constant and predominating ascendancy, and even his literary writings have a strong political flavor; classification is not always easy; in fact there are included in the present volume two writings which Mazzini himself classed in 1861 as political: *Pensieri: Ai Poeti del Secolo XIX.*; and *Rome*

Souterraine, par Charles Didier. In all, this volume contains thirty-two articles, of which only one-half appeared in the earlier *Scritti Editi e Inediti*. The other sixteen were all originally published in the *Indicatore Livornese* and the *Giovine Italia*, the two rarest periodicals of the period; six of these, being of doubtful origin, are grouped separately in an appendix. No critical notes are given, but an excellent preface contains important and detailed bibliographical information. Unfortunately the subject-indexes which added so materially to the usefulness of the earlier edition will be wanting in the national edition, with what excuse it is difficult to understand.

H. N. G.

I Martiri di Belliore e il loro Processo: Narrazione Storica Documentata. Per ALESSANDRO LUZIO. (Milano: Tipografia Editrice L. F. Cogliati. 1905. Two vols., pp. xx, 414; 422.)

Profili Biografici e Bozzetti Storici. Per ALESSANDRO LUZIO. (Milano: Casa Editrice L. F. Cogliati. 1906. Pp. vii, 534.)

IN the last decade no one has done more for the progress of historical studies upon the period of the Italian *Risorgimento*, both in bringing forward new evidence from unpublished sources and in the establishment of rigorous standards of criticism, than Alessandro Luzzo. His first work of importance in this field was a monograph upon *Le Cinque Giornate di Milano* (1899). This has been followed by *Antonio Salvetti* (1901); *Radetzky* (1901); *Il Processo Pellico-Maroncelli* (1903); *Giuseppe Mazzini* (1905); and by the above-noted *I Martiri di Belliore*. In *Le Cinque Giornate* he made use of much published Austrian material that had been neglected by preceding Italian, French, and English historians, the judicial examination of which may be said to have placed the history of this important episode for the first time upon a sound critical basis. In his other works, relating principally, it will be observed, to Italian struggles against Austria in the Lombardo-Veneto, upon which the documents of one party are of necessity exclusively in German, he has continued to use all the Austrian sources available, in this alone making a notable step forward toward the definitive *Risorgimento* history of this region of Italy.

The breadth of view and sincerity of historical purpose evinced by this impartiality in investigation have emphasized rather than obscured Luzzo's honest patriotism, and have won for him the confidence of many private depositories of valuable unpublished documents, which have been placed at his disposal; while as director of the Royal Archives of Mantua he has had access also to rich stores of state documents in Mantua and elsewhere. In *I Martiri di Belliore* he has taken full advantage of these exceptional opportunities, and has succeeded in bringing together a mass of well-ordered and carefully weighed evidence that has secured recognition for his volumes as by far the most important source upon the famous Austrian political trials and executions of Mantua from 1852 to 1855, and assures them a permanent place among primary

authorities for the grim period of repression and conspiracy which intervened in the Lombardo-Veneto between the revolution of 1848 and the liberations of 1859 and 1866. Luzio obtained his most important unpublished material from privately donated documents in the museums of national history in Brescia, Padua, and particularly Mantua, from the testimony of survivors of the rigors of Austrian justice, and from documents preserved by the relatives and heirs of the "martyrs". Appendixes of the first volume and the entire second volume are given up to the publication of documents, of which many others are embodied in full in Luzio's narrative. They include farewell letters of condemned patriots, dated on the eve of mounting the scaffold; many clandestine letters written amid the inhuman sufferings of fetid dungeons and menaces of torture worse than death, brutally repeated to force confessions and revelations; fragments of autobiography and prison reminiscences; proclamations and sentences of Austrian military tribunals and special courts of justice; a list of those brought to trial, with brief biographical notes; and many miscellaneous documents of varying importance relating to this same tragic phase of the Austrian domination. Some had been previously published in newspapers or in equally dispersed sources; others in a more or less fragmentary form had seen the light in pamphlets now rare. *Le Ultime Lettere di Tito Speri* (Rome, 1887) are here reprinted, newly edited from the originals, with the addition of three letters previously unpublished. The fragmentary *Cenni Biografici e Scritti Vari di Anna Filippini Poma e del Dottore Carlo Poma* (Mantua, 1867) are reprinted also from the originals and in full. Of the important letters of the noble priest Enrico Tazzoli, a part had been previously published by Cantù and Martini, but several hitherto unknown are here given. Such letters are of the first importance, but though generally written in perfect sincerity, they must be used with the utmost caution. The Austrian police methods of sowing suspicion among the accused, and the prisoners' uncertain means of communication, frequently led the latter into false statements upon whatever they did not themselves experience, or view as eye-witnesses. In the sifting of this difficult evidence Luzio has exhibited superior skill and serenity of judgment; notably in the discussion of Castellazzo's culpability as an informer he has shown much impartiality, giving careful attention to extenuating circumstances.

As a whole the volumes form one of the most damning indictments ever brought against a modern government, but as Luzio himself protests, the fault lies with Austria and not in a *parti pris* of the historian. One overwhelming conviction alone can result from an examination of the evidence presented: that a government maintained at such a cost of human debasement, brutality, and crime could by no argument justify its existence, and that if ever there were just wars, they were those of 1859 and 1866, which freed Lombardia and the Veneto from Teutonic domination and made a repetition of the political trials of Mantua impossible. And it would seem that the Austrian government itself

realized the character of this domination, when it refused to open to Luzio the Allgemeines Archiv des K. K. Ministeriums des Innern or the Kriegsarchiv in Vienna. Until the reports of the police and of the military inquisitions there deposited are known, definitive history cannot be written; but nothing which they contain can mitigate the horrors of the anti-national oppression already revealed. When the time arrives in Austria for greater liberty in historical studies, it is to be hoped that Luzio will be permitted to be among the first to examine the sources which now must remain concealed. For the present he will undoubtedly be content to see these last volumes suffer the fate of prohibition in the Austrian dominions which was meted out by the Austrian press censor to his earlier *Radetzky*.

Aside from the monographs above mentioned, Luzio has published in recent years several briefer historical studies in periodicals. Some of these, together with many book-reviews, written principally for the *Corriere della Sera*, he has now brought together in the volume entitled *Profilì Biografici e Bozzetti Storici*. The greater number of these studies relate to the history of the *Risorgimento*; among the more important are: "Costanza Arconati", a sketch of "the good genius of the exiles of 1821", with many of her letters, 1829-1860; "Mantova nel Quarantotto", a defense of the conduct of the Mantuans in 1848; "Il primo Amore di Ippolito Nievo", and "Il Pensiero Artistico e Politico di G. Verdi", both of considerable biographical importance; and reviews of Abba's *La Vita di Bixio* (1905), Lumbroso's *Il Processo di Persano* (1905), Bartsch's *Haynau* (1903), and Barrili's edition of the *Scritti di Mameli* (1902). In his book-reviews Luzio invariably succeeds in contributing some new fact, frequently some document previously unpublished, or neglected in the volume reviewed; so that for its original material, as well as for its bibliographical information, his *Profilì* is of greater value than most books of this character.

H. NELSON GAY.

Erinnerungen, Aufsätze und Reden. Von HANS DELBRÜCK, Professor der modernen Geschichte in der Universität Berlin. (Berlin: Georg Stilke. 1905. Pp. 625.)

THIS volume by the widely known editor of the *Preussische Jahrbücher* brings together the same kind of material as was published by Professor Delbrück in 1887 as *Historische und politische Aufsätze*; the change of title is rather obscurely explained as due to the introduction of a stronger personal element. The 625 pages comprise thirty-four papers of quite varied character both in style and in subject; all but five were published in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* 1887-1901, and only two appear to have received any modifying revision. The topics are for the most part incidents or aspects of the nineteenth-century reconstruction of Germany, the only important exceptions being a paper on the Seven Years' War and three on social democracy. The leaning to mili-

tary history of the author of a *History of the Art of War* (2 vols., 1900) is strongly shown.

The fact that the book appears as a third edition should perhaps insure the suppression of doubts as to its usefulness. But the reviewer may still venture to assert that such volumes are usually uncalled for and are rarely inspiring. Many of these chips from Professor Delbrück's workshop were interesting contributions in their time, appearing as they did with editorial prestige; why the general reader should now value a collection of them, or why the special reader should not be quite content with their deposit in the files of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, would perhaps not be very easy to explain.

The most serious studies in the volume are those entitled "Das Geheimnis der Napoleonischen Politik im Jahre 1870" (pp. 301-357) and "Der Ursprung des Siebenjährigen Krieges" (pp. 240-269), and some idea of the nature and calibre of the whole may perhaps be given by a slight examination of them. They were in their day (1895-1896) rather noteworthy papers, for they set forth or called wider attention to novel if not paradoxical positions. As in them both the author placed himself in opposition to most of his old associates among the students of recent German history (mainly the *Historische Zeitschrift* group), we must credit him with independence and open-mindedness; on the other hand he seems to betray an undue leaning to the historical novelty. The title of the first of these essays might be suspected of verging on sensationalism, especially as it will be found that what is represented as the special Napoleonic secret (an intention on the part of the French government to win by rapid military movements such advantages as would enable it to throw aside the association with Austria and Italy and force Prussia to concede Belgium to France in return for French support of Prussian control in Germany) is given but a minor degree of attention and is by no means proved. Most of the paper is devoted to other sides of the situation in 1870, and Professor Delbrück is apparently more successful in maintaining (especially as against Sybel in his latest contributions), first, that there *did* exist in the early part of the year a warlike anti-Prussian understanding if not alliance between at least France and Austria, and second, that Bismarck was responsible for the manipulation of the Hohenzollern candidacy and the Ems incident so as to bring on war. The paper is thus of decided value, though even in this latest form it by no means clears up the situation.

The article entitled "Der Ursprung des Siebenjährigen Krieges" was originally even more controversial (in this revision the direct controversial parts are largely omitted). In it Delbrück had entered the lists as a thick-and-thin supporter of the Lehmann and Lückwaldt contention that Frederic as well as Maria Theresa was seeking war in 1756, that "zwei Offensiven seien aufeinandergestossen", and that if Frederic were not to be assumed to have begun operations for the purpose of getting at least north Saxony if not also West Prussia, he must be deposed from the pedestal he had occupied. Ten years ago the con-

troversy on this matter raged with great fury, and Teutonic amenities flew fiercely from both camps; pure exhaustion only seems to have stilled the storm, for no sufficient agreement was reached to serve as the basis of a treaty of peace. The Delbrück appearance in the fray only widened the circle of spectators without adding views or material of moment, and the reappearance now of these arguments only suggests reflections on the standards of heroism and statesmanship that were made the prevailing ones in Germany by the glamor of the Bismarckian triumphs. That after his seizure of Silesia the great Frederic should have thought to be content to spend the rest of his days or even a few years in replenishing his resources, developing peaceful industry, and assimilating the new population is declared to stamp him as a weakling if not a fool. Only by crediting him with the intention of proceeding shortly to the improvement of the connections between Brandenburg and Silesia by the seizure of Saxony can his claim to greatness be sustained. And so Delbrück declares that he started in 1755 to bring on war that he might seize Saxony, and declines to regard his reputation as in any wise impaired by the trivial facts that (from this point of view) he entirely failed and that he had entirely miscalculated the situation. For did he not thus furnish the German youth of the future with whole pages of exploits?

It is doctrine of this sort that Denis has probably had in mind in declaring in his recent book on Germany that the German cry for war in 1870 was largely due to the production by the university teaching of a youth that "n'a qu'un credo: la conviction de la supériorité de la vertu et de la science germaniques; qu'une religion: la force; qu'un besoin: la domination".

VICTOR COFFIN.

Frederick York Powell, a Life; and a Selection from his Letters and Occasional Writings. By OLIVER ELTON. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1906. Two vols., pp. xvi, 461; xvi, 464.)

It is unusual for a reviewer in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW to use the first person singular in reviewing a new book, and the writer of this review in the course of nearly thirty years of writing reviews has never done such a thing before. But the editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW may be pleased to make an exception in this case, since the reviewer was not only an intimate friend of the late professor of history at Oxford, whose life has just been published, but believes that he has certain criticisms to offer which can only be justified by an assertion of personal recollections, of which the value must lie in the credibility of the writer.

To sum up rapidly the value of the work, it may be stated at once that the life of York Powell well deserved to be written, and that it has been written in a tactful and interesting fashion. The many-sidedness of the man has been well brought out; the attractive nature of his personality is excellently displayed; the facts of his career are correctly

noted; his fugitive work has been tastefully brought together; and all the friends of York Powell—and he had a genius for friendship—will be grateful to Mr. Elton for placing this memorial of their departed friend in their hands. A review article is not the place in which to summarize the facts of York Powell's life; these are to be found in his biography. But a review article is the only place in which the importance of his work as a professor of history can be criticized and estimated, and it is upon this subject that the present reviewer believes he has something worth the saying.

Mr. Elton, as I have said, has excellently put together the facts of York Powell's life, and has brought out with particular skill the latter years of that life, after his appointment to the Regius Professorship of Modern History at Oxford, in succession to Froude, in 1894. My intimacy with Powell began in 1882 and continued until 1894 when I came to America. I well remember the beginning of his acquaintance with Mr. Elton, and can therefore state that I have some qualifications to discuss the development of York Powell's ideas as to history in the years before he made Mr. Elton's acquaintance. Others, like his friend and successor in the chair of history, Mr. C. H. Firth, might have contributed something along this line to Mr. Elton's biography of York Powell, but I believe that I am right in saying that he discussed history at greater length with me than with any one else during those formative years. I can remember many long sessions, when I was his guest at Christ Church, in which we discussed the new developments in the trade of a historian, and I witnessed his gradual conversion from a somewhat romantic idealism and even from a tampering with the so-called philosophy of history into the strenuous assertion of the modern views of the historian's work, which is so well set forth in certain papers reprinted by Mr. Elton in the first section of his second volume. When I first knew York Powell he was a law tutor at Christ Church with a prodigious memory, a vast fund of miscellaneous knowledge, and an instinct for the scientific investigation of the truth. But he was not yet a historian. His scientific training had been acquired by his studies with Vigfusson in preparing the *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, and his trend of thought was rather toward Icelandic scholarship than historical work. But during the twelve years in which I saw much of him, and especially after Vigfusson's death, he turned more and more toward history, and alike in his reviewing work for the *Manchester Guardian* and in his semi-editorial work for the Clarendon Press, as for instance upon Sir James Ramsay's *Lancaster and York*, he began to consider the principles upon which history should be written. Since he had never had any regular historical training, he had to work out those principles for himself. Beginning in the early eighties with a distinct interest in the philosophy of history and some rather fanciful ideas as to the duties of a historian, the rigor of his training with Vigfusson and of his own law studies turned him more and more toward the practical duties of a historian in discovering and stating the truth.

This change in his point of view was not due to any individual influence, but he fought it out for himself, and as I was then engaged in active historical work and was fighting out the same battle for myself, we naturally spent much time in discussing this matter. It is difficult to imagine in these days of historical seminars, in which Langlois and Seignobos's *Introduction to the Study of History* and Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* are in daily use, the extent of the isolation of Oxford historical scholars twenty-five years ago from the great movement of scientific history upon the continent of Europe. Stubbs indeed was Regius Professor of Modern History, but we had to gather his method from his work and not from direct instruction; learned historical students there were among our history tutors like C. W. Boase and G. W. Kitchen and J. Franck Bright, but they taught us more of historical facts than of historical criticism; brilliant young men there were, who have since fulfilled their early promise like C. H. Firth and J. H. Round and Reginald Lane Poole, but they were busy in laying the foundation of future erudition; some great historians there were, like Mandell Creighton and S. R. Gardiner, who visited Oxford but did not help its aspiring young historians; so that we had to work out our problems for ourselves. It was York Powell who first set me to a task of historical work in pressing upon me the undertaking of a history of the French Revolution. I realize to-day the rashness of my attempt and with particular force the absurdity of my making such an attempt without any of the historical apparatus, which is now so liberally bestowed upon undergraduate students in a German or in an American university. But to the undertaking of that task I owe much of the long intercourse with York Powell in the days when he was working toward his theory of the duty of the historian. Of this struggle toward the light Mr. Elton, and with good reason, since he could know nothing of it, tells nothing in his life of York Powell. And yet the chief importance of York Powell's career lies in the fact that as successor of Froude he turned away from Froudacity to inculcate into the minds of friends and students the meaning and the method of the modern school of history. Stubbs indeed has left a larger historical monument behind him, but he never breathed into others, as York Powell did, during his professorship, the sense of the historian's duty to seek the truth without swerving to follow out a personal opinion. As Mr. Elton points out, York Powell used his personality as an immense incentive for getting work out of others; I doubt if there has ever been any Oxford man who has made others work so much as he did; I doubt if there has ever been a scholar who gave of his store of knowledge and of his originality of thought more help to others; and the multiplicity of his prefaces to other men's work is a proof of itself of the personality of a great teacher. Mr. Firth, as his successor, will find his work of bringing the study of history at Oxford up to date much lightened by the fact that York Powell went before him. This then was York Powell's true work, the turning of the point of

view of history in Oxford from the philosophical to the scientific standpoint, and so great were his services in this direction that I have felt it worth while to use the personal note and to dwell upon the development of York Powell's point of view in history during the formative years instead of merely summarizing the contents of Mr. Elton's book.

But I cannot leave the subject of York Powell without re-enforcing some of Mr. Elton's kindly appreciations. The York Powell of the eighties, when he was feeling his way, was the same man as the professor of the later period. He was the most helpful man that I have ever known, helpful in brains, in sympathy, and in purse; loving dearly and being loved dearly; the more lovable because of his prejudices and because of his sweet unconsciousness of his superiority to other men. I remember in particular one evening in his little old room in Christ Church before he moved to the comparative spaciousness of his later dwelling-place there, when Powell met in argument a group of specialists in history, as we should call them nowadays, and after vanquishing each of them in their own particular subjects set to work to dilate at length on the difference between the Deal and the Newcastle styles of prize-fighting and thereby reduced the rest of us to silence. Yet the effect he left upon his hearers was then, as always, a sense of admiration and not of the slightest resentment. Of his friends in those days, of Purcell in particular, whom he admired so heartily, there might have been more place made in Mr. Elton's biography, but the friends of York Powell need no biography to remind them of the friend that they have lost. I can personally confirm Mr. Elton's mild statement that York Powell was prejudiced against Jews and Roman Catholics and Americans. But his prejudice was general and not particular. Where he found a man in trouble or ready to work, York Powell forgot race and origin. Let Dr. Gross testify that his great work on *The Gild Merchant* would never have seen the light but for York Powell's hearty aid; let his friendship for Father Barry, the novelist, refute his hard words on Catholics; and let those American students who went to his rooms at Oxford bear testimony that his feeling against the United States never prevented his sympathy with individual American students. I confess that he never quite forgave my coming to America; we were neither of us good correspondents; but if there was anybody to be helped no one was more ready, even to write a letter, than York Powell. The last letter I ever received from him was about the son of a former friend of ours, upon whom he invoked the curse that fell upon Kipling's "Tomlinson." But this review has gone far enough; it has been written greatly against the grain, for to find one of one's contemporaries and intimates thought worthy of a biography seems a startling proof of oncoming old age; but it seemed to me that the readers of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* from a reading of Mr. Elton's book could not place York Powell properly, or estimate his influence upon the study of history properly, unless some one who knew him as I did should set forth his greatest

achievement, his leadership in changing the trend of historical studies at Oxford. Nowhere can his views be better seen than in the brief preface he wrote to the translation of Langlois and Seignobos's *Introduction to the Study of History*. One little piece of information I may give Mr. Elton; the apologue of Froude which he admired so much (I. 171) was not "A Siding at a Railway Station", but "The Cat's Pilgrimage."

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

The International Law and Diplomacy of the Russo-Japanese War.

By AMOS S. HERSHEY, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science and International Law in Indiana University. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1906. Pp. xii, 394.)

Two books in English have preceded this, bearing upon the same subject. One, by T. J. Lawrence, was written in 1904 in the midst of exciting events relating to war and neutrality. It is an unpretentious volume, stating briefly and with scarcely any citation of authorities what the author believed to be the law applicable to a variety of incidents which had deeply stirred the British public. It did not include even in the second edition the North Sea tragedy. Of necessity the acts upon which he commented could be but partially and inaccurately known to the author. But his conclusions were sound and their appearance timely. Professor Hershey quotes Lawrence freely and approvingly.

The other book, by Smith and Sibley, appeared in 1905 and is characterized by Hershey (p. 172 n.) as a "bulky and pretentious volume". It certainly is not a very satisfactory treatise because it wanders interminably from the point and is sometimes absurd and inaccurate. It does not discuss the causes of the war but confines itself to questions of prize and of neutrality.

The book under review has the advantage over its forerunners in that an additional year has enabled its author to secure a more accurate statement of facts, to marshal his authorities and precedents much more fully, to learn the result of appeal in certain admiralty cases, and to look at the war with rather more perspective. Professor Hershey has made excellent use of his time and opportunities. His book is an adequate, judicial, and thorough discussion of the many highly important events of the war in the East. As the title implies, there is diplomacy as well as law in it. The events prior to the war and its closing scenes at Portsmouth, with prize law and the rules of war and neutrality in between, form a kind of intellectual sandwich.

That, like its predecessors, it finds Russia alone at fault save in one minor instance was inevitable, for this is the conclusion which the facts warrant.

In the earlier diplomacy Hershey relies largely upon Asakawa's admirable volume, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict*. We have laid before us a calm, patient, painstaking narrative of the diplomatic moves

in the Far East between the years 1894 and 1904. The sequence of events hardly needs explanation, so well do the treaties, agreements, and other documents cited cover the ground. One feature only might possibly have been touched upon which is left unmentioned, the apparent quickening of Russian aggression after England had become deeply involved in South Africa. It is an absorbing story of Russian advance, slow, resistless, with much under the surface, like a glacier: with a perfectly legitimate desire at bottom, an ice-free port on the Pacific, but seeking this object in ways that were illegitimate and threatened the integrity of the East.

Chinese intrigue, railway concessions, and the Russo-Chinese Bank, the skilful use of railway guards, the opportunity of the Boxer outbreak, the beginning of a new move upon Korea, the possession of Port Arthur, Alexiieff's malign influence, the reinforcement of army and navy—all these facts officially proven were signs of the storm brewing which no one could mistake, least of all the Russian. And so the reader is led on to the first question of law raised, the necessity of a declaration of war prior to hostilities. When a fair diplomatic warning was given, when relations were broken, when all the rest of the world knew that the next act would be in violence, how could astute Russia fail to know it too?

The questions of law which the war gave rise to were numerous and serious, some of them novel: Were the purchases of merchant steamers with capabilities for military use, from neutral owners, lawful? What was the status of the new wireless telegraphy? How shall one judge the question of liability for those dangerous contact mines found floating far out at sea? Had Russia the right arbitrarily to enlarge the list of contraband, to reject the theory of conditional contraband, to sink the neutral carrying contraband?

Then there were the varying neutral theories of asylum and of hospitality to belligerent ships; a comparison of the declarations of neutrality; a contrast of the loyalty with which the combatants observed the provisions of the Hague Code; and the Dogger Bank incident when war hung in the balance.

I find myself in substantial agreement with the author's treatment of all these topics. He is judicial, he is temperate, he is sound, he is wonderfully fair and liberal in his citations of authorities. In truth the running down of many of his facts must have involved much labor. With some effort one might criticize the author's attitude toward the war correspondent and the wireless as not entirely fair to the belligerent. Possibly he follows Lawrence too closely in saying that the Chefoo wireless was discontinued in August, 1904; whereas Baron Kaneko declared that this breach of neutrality was permitted by China until late that year. I wish the real value of the commission of inquiry in the North Sea incident might have been emphasized, that is, the fact that it gave a chance for passion to cool off. In such minor matters here and there one might take issue, but on the other hand there is

original well-digested comment on almost every page upon a variety of hotly disputed questions, which will make the book of permanent value. Whether it is the last word on the subject may be doubted. For perhaps Takahashi or some other Japanese publicist on the one side and de Martens on the other may clear up certain matters yet with official information.

Nor is it likely that we yet know the full truth as to the real reasons underlying the Portsmouth treaty. Hershey truly thinks that this was far from being a diplomatic victory for Russia. It fairly embodied the principle of *uti possidetis*; sufficient proof of its equity. Credits were growing low; the trans-Siberian railway had shown unexpected capability; the Russian army probably outnumbered the Japanese, and each retreat improved its position. It had become too big to be bagged. The Japanese had won every battle; they had won everything essential. It was a war of defense, and a treaty of defense was indicated. Would it be surprising if the future should reveal that Japan in her inscrutable way saw that the psychological moment had come, persuaded Mr. Roosevelt to initiate negotiations in her behalf, emphasized the non-indispensable while securing what she most wanted in the treaty itself, and won as great a victory in diplomacy as she had done in war? There are a few typographical or other errors but none of a misleading kind: 1897 for 1807 (p. 75); Count Lansdowne (p. 230); "navel" for naval (p. 143); and half a dozen misprints.

This is in every way a very good piece of work indeed.

THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot, 985-1503. Edited by JULIUS E. OLSON and EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE. [*Original Narratives of Early American History.* Edited by J. FRANKLIN JAMESON. Volume I.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. Pp. xv, 443.)

At its annual meeting in December, 1902, the American Historical Association approved and adopted the plan of the present series, choosing Dr. J. Franklin Jameson as its general editor. The purpose of the series is to provide historical students and the libraries of schools and colleges with a comprehensive and well-rounded collection of those narratives on which the early history of the United States is founded; and the present volume forms a good beginning to this excellent and laudable undertaking. Thus under the *Northmen* Professor J. E. Olson of Wisconsin prints the Vinland narrations in the *Saga of Eric the Red* and in the *Flat Island Book* (Flateyjarbok), together with extracts from Adam of Bremen, from the Icelandic Annals, relative to Vinland and Markland, adding versions of the Papal Letters of 1448 and 1492 (from Nicholas V. and Alexander VI.) dealing with Green-

land. Again under *Columbus* Professor E. G. Bourne gives us the Articles of Agreement between Columbus and the Catholic kings (April 17, 1492); the Official Grant of Titles by the latter to the former (April 30, 1492); the Journal of the First Voyage (from Sir Clements Markham's version of the fuller text discovered in 1825); the Letters of Columbus to Luis de Santangel and to the Catholic sovereigns (March 14, 1493, and later); Dr. Chanca's Letter on Columbus's Second Voyage; Las Casas's record of the Third Voyage; and the Admiral's Letters descriptive of his Fourth Voyage and of his sufferings and ill treatment (the latter addressed to the Nurse of Prince John). Lastly under the Cabots Professor Bourne reprints the Letters of Pasqualigo and Soncino (August 23, 24, and December 18, 1497), and Pedro de Ayala's despatch to Ferdinand and Isabella (July 25, 1498).

Most serviceable and in all ways to be welcomed is this volume, as has been said. But it might have been made still more serviceable. Why, for instance, did the editor not furnish us with the Vinland and other American references from the Icelandic historian Are Frode, from the famous traveller abbot Nicolas of Thingeyre, from the *Kristni Saga*, the *Eyrbyggja Saga*, and the *Grettis Saga*, references which add so concisely and suggestively to the chain of testimony reaching down from the earliest Icelandic chronicler to the composition of *Red Eric Saga* in the thirteenth century? Surely it would have been better to print all these among our texts, at the cost of some three or four additional pages of transcription, rather than merely to give, as he has done, a version of the *Kristni Saga* passage in a foot-note to the introduction, while referring the inquirer to A. M. Reeves's *Winland the Good* for the rest.

Also I would suggest that Adam of Bremen, the first and best historian of northern Germany in the Middle Ages, the one contemporary who has preserved a record of the polar voyage of Harald Hardrada, is not adequately dealt with in note 1, p. 67; that his primary position (in time order) among the witnesses to the Scandinavian discovery of America is either not properly appreciated or at least not duly emphasized; and that Professor Olson's seeming acquiescence (pp. 6-7) in the common and ignorant presumption of a complete "absence of contemporary record" for the Vinland voyages does wrong to the chronicler of the church of Hamburg—like Bede, an investigator of much more than ecclesiastical affairs. For, as the dates furnished by Mr. Olson sufficiently testify, both Adam and his royal informant Svein Estrithson of Denmark (from whom the passage on the "insula . . . quae dicitur Winland" is mainly derived) are younger contemporaries of Leif Ericson and Thorfinn Karlsefne—to say nothing of Are Frode, whose birth (in 1067) lies within a measurable distance of the American discoveries of the "Vinland-farers" (1000-1006).

Again, why not have added to the concluding medieval notices of Greenland in papal letters some earlier references to the same country such as those in Adam himself, in Ordericus Vitalis, in other Middle

Age historians and geographers, together with the really important statements in Ivar Bardsen's *Descriptio*, and in Icelandic and ecclesiastical annals.

And in the same way, would it have been difficult to annex to the Cabot documents here printed the Petition and First Letters Patent of March 5, 1496 (the fundamental document relating to John Cabot's earliest "American" voyage), together with the despatch of March 28, 1496, from Ferdinand and Isabella to Ruy Gonzales de Puebla, their senior ambassador in England, Henry VII's grant of August 10, 1497, "to him that found the new isle", John Cabot's pension order of December 13, 1497, and second letters patent of February 3, 1498? The insertion of these (or at least of their material passages) would not have required very much space, and would certainly have been welcome to many of those for whom this admirable series is especially intended.¹

C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY.

Christopher Columbus and the New World of his Discovery. A Narrative by FILSON YOUNG, with a Note on the Navigation of Columbus's First Voyage by the EARL OF DUNRAVEN, K.P. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company; London: E. Grant Richards. 1906. Two vols., pp. xxi, 323; ix, 399.)

THIS new life of the discoverer of America, although based to some extent on a study of the documents, is distinctly a popular work which offers nothing which need detain the scholar except the valuable and interesting "Note on the Navigation of Columbus's First Voyage by the Earl of Dunraven, K. P." This little treatise of some thirty pages throws light on many a passage in the Columbus narratives which the editors have left in obscurity. For example, Columbus frequently refers to the position of the "Guards", Beta and Gamma in the constellation of Ursa Minor. There is in particular the passage in the *Journal* of September 30, which has been mistranslated or, if correctly translated, left without explanation by every editor of that narrative. The Earl of Dunraven gives a lucid interpretation of the passage in question and explains the use made by sailors of the position "of the Guards" in determining the time in the night.

The most distinct merit in the body of the work is the rather full quotation from Columbus's own writings to illustrate his character or purposes. The translations in almost all cases are those given by Mr. John Boyd Thacher in his *Columbus*, who authorized Mr. Young to draw freely from them. Mr. Young's narrative is lively but too much interspersed with "purple passages". His model as a historian has only too plainly been Carlyle, whose pale ghost meets one at every turn. In criticism he adopts Mr. Vignaud's radical and destructive conclusions

¹ Some of these omissions might be defended on the ground that the series is intended to be a collection of narratives and not of documents, and that it does not aim at completeness, but is made up by selection. Ed.

in regard to the Toscanelli correspondence. On the other hand, he retells the egg story, which he characterizes (I. 257) as "a sufficiently inane story . . . ; but there is enough character in this little feat, ponderous, deliberate, pompous, ostentatious, and at bottom a trick and deceitful quibble, to make it accord with the grandiloquent public manner of Columbus, and to make it easily believable of one who chose to show himself in his speech and writings so much more meanly and pretentiously than he showed himself in the true acts and business of his life." The rejection of the incident of the egg story (first attributed to Columbus by Benzoni, a literary compiler, a half-century later, and told of Brunelleschi and his dome a half-century before the voyage of Columbus) is a sufficiently established result of criticism to have saved Mr. Young his reflections on it. In many cases the historically-minded student will be irritated by Mr. Young's flippant and journalistic comments on subjects of importance like the Demarcation Bulls.

Mr. Young devotes a page to "the work called *Libro de las Profecias*, or Book of the Prophecies, in which he wrote down such considerations as occurred to him in his stupor. . . . The manuscript of this work is in existence, although no human being has ever ventured to reprint the whole of it" (II. 145-146). It is reprinted in the *Raccolta Colombiana*, and is not at all what Mr. Young describes it to be, but mainly a collection of scripture texts supposed to relate to the recovery of Jerusalem and the end of the world. Mr. Young scornfully reproduces one of the calculations in this work, no better or no worse than would be found in any orthodox commentary on Daniel or the Apocalypse down to within a generation, and then exclaims in his favorite Carlylese: "Good Heavens! in what an entirely dark and sordid stupor is our Christopher now sunk—a veritable slough and quag of stupor out of which, if he does not manage to flounder himself, no human hand can pull him."

In conclusion, the most serious deficiency in Mr. Young's work is not its occasional errors, but its great lack of the true historical spirit of interpretation. It is the work of a clear and versatile writer, but not of a historical scholar. It will amuse and interest the general reader and not seriously mislead him as to the career of Columbus, but from it he will gain little instruction in historical interpretation.

E. G. B.

A History of the United States and its People from their Earliest Records to the Present Time. By ELROY MCKENDREE AVERY. In fifteen volumes. Volume II. (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company. 1905. Pp. xxxvi, 458.)

IN this second installment of the series which, according to the announcement on the title-page, is to be extended from twelve volumes to fifteen, Dr. Avery describes the projection of French, English, Dutch, and Swede on to the Atlantic seaboard, and the vicissitudes befalling them after arrival, from 1600 to 1660 approximately. Obedient to the

intimation given in the preface, the treatment of the theme is by "transverse sections rather than by longitudinal fibers". An inspection of the table of contents would imply that this means a grouping of chapters according to time, place, institutions, individuals, and episodes, in all of which the historical sequence is not always clear.

On the whole the volume is superior to its predecessor. The sense of proportion is better developed, and the transatlantic environment of the narrative affords a more adequate understanding of the truth that the colonies in North America, during the seventeenth century at least, were an expansion of certain European countries rather than the germ of future independent states on the soil of the New World. The maps, also, maintain their excellence, and the illustrations show distinct improvement in their quality. If the maps, indeed, continue throughout the series to preserve their present high standard of workmanship and usefulness, their publication in a separate volume would perform a real service to the students of American history.

The defects of the book are mainly stylistic and constructional, although misinterpretations and actual errors are not lacking. On these points the reviewer is loath to descant at length. Not only have many of them been cited in critical notices already published, but the truculent manner in which Dr. Avery in his preface bids defiance to the "professed student" of history is quite too intimidating. With malice toward persons whose "analytic and microbic Research immensely overshadows [their] co-ordinating activity", and with charity for all that much-abused community, the "general public", the author does not descend into "abyssal notes, overladen with trivial details, and told with such portentous long-windedness that only professional students, examinees, schoolmasters and their pupils really master them". Instead he draws them from the abyss, and, converting them into oracular opinions uttered by Professor This and Doctor That, pushes them into the text itself. One might venture a doubt, perhaps, whether the "general public" is so familiar with the literature of the subject that a mental salaam to the ipse dixits of the worthy scholars in question will be a necessary result.

When the thread of the story is single, Dr. Avery spins it smoothly. As its strands multiply and tighten, he is apt to let them run forward and backward until they leave the wheel and tangle themselves up in such a mesh as the treatment of the history of Massachusetts. At other times when the historical processes grow complex, and dramatic possibilities emerge, he marshals his metaphors in a manner truly imposing. Speaking of the growth of Separatism in England, Dr. Avery exclaims (p. 94): "These were days of quickening life. An English Bible and the Lollard leaven prepared the way for a revolt against the papacy. Luther sprang up in Germany, a moral volcano that shot its glare across western Europe and aroused its people to a new activity. Aided by an amorous eruption on the throne, England cut loose from Rome and snatched her crown from the shadow of the tiara." It seems hardly

fair to call Henry VIII., with all his faults, an "eruption", even if Sir Harry Vane may have been "a pretty fleck of cavalier color on a sombre Puritan canvas—a fresh-blown English rose blooming in a bed of New England immortelles" (p. 278). It should be admitted, however, that these rhetorical embellishments are not so common as in the first volume, nor do the tripping jingles in the text set the mind so oft a-dancing.

In the realm of misunderstanding and misstatement, the chapter on the "evolution of the English colonial system" needs a thorough revision. Not only does it ignore the share of Parliament in the growth of imperial administration, but it makes a large number of assertions which are either erroneous or so vague as to create impressions altogether false. Elsewhere in the volume questionable statements like the following may be found: that under the charters of 1609 and 1612 "Virginia held until the formation of the federal constitution in 1788" (p. 53); that in 1621 the "termination of the continental wars threw the services of gallant thousands upon a glutted market" (p. 73); that King James was laying plans for the marriage of his son to the sister of the Spanish monarch (p. 75), and to the daughter of that ruler (p. 76); that in 1624 Virginia "again" became a royal province (p. 77); that Spain had obtained from the New World no profits other than plunder (p. 80); that the title "king of France" borne by the English king in 1620 was "sixty-two years behind the truth" (p. 117); that the Swedish settlement on the Delaware was "the only colony ever planted by that nation" (p. 229); and that "the idea of local self-government . . . was a leading principle of the primeval polity of the Goths" (p. 343). The word "Antinomian", finally, is often used without a definition of its concrete meaning in Massachusetts history; and the typographical errors on page 273 seem quite inexcusable.

Despite all these shortcomings, the reviewer adheres to the opinion expressed in his critique of the first volume (*AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, X. 852-856), namely, that Dr. Avery's work promises to be the best popular history of the United States which has yet appeared.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

Die Kolonisation des Mississippitalen bis zum Ausgange der französischen Herrschaft. Eine kolonialhistorische Studie von ALEXANDER FRANZ, Ph.D. (Leipzig: Georg Wigand; New York: G. E. Stechert and Company. 1906. Pp. xxiv, 464.)

As the publication of a new work on the Mississippi valley seems to require some justification, the author states with care the causes that have led him to produce this rather bulky volume. First, he has found no scientific work of a comprehensive character which deals with this particular period in the history of the valley. Among the American authors the lack of a thorough, scientific treatment is marked; among French authors, Villiers du Terrage has, indeed, covered a por-

tion of the period of French occupation, but his book is too largely devoted to defending the memory of Kerlerec. Very naturally, says Dr. Franz, no Frenchman has cared to attempt to describe in detail the failures and losses of French colonization in old Louisiana. If the task is now taken up by a German, it is because the author, though now resident in Europe, was born in the Mississippi valley and spent the early years of his life there. Moreover, Dr. Franz believes that his study of this long past history of early colonization in America will be of interest and profit to the Fatherland, which is now standing at the threshold of its colonial development. French colonization in the Mississippi valley was a failure; but the investigation of the causes of that failure may serve as an object-lesson to Germans, who, starting far behind the other nations as colonizers, have no time to lose in useless experiments. Thus the author hopes that his book will serve not only scientific but also national ends. At a later time he expects to find the opportunity to write the history of the Mississippi valley down to the present time. In this work of the future he purposes to use the archives which, on account of his professional duties, he was unable to consult for the present work.

All historical students will regret that the author was not able to consult the archives of the Louisiana Historical Society or, better, those of Paris; for many times in this work he seems in doubt which of conflicting statements in secondary authorities he should accept, when access to the "sources" would have settled the question. Moreover, he occasionally falls into errors of fact, apparently because he has not the sources before him. Thus he states that the riches of the "sieben Städte von Quivira" were reported by De Vaca (p. 22). De Vaca, however, did not mention these cities. It is not correct to state that when Coronado led his expedition to the north, the Moor Estevanico was in his train (p. 22). The Moor went on the expedition of Fray Marcos. The view that La Salle purposely missed the mouth of the Mississippi and went to Texas (pp. 46, 52) was held by Shea, but he never proved it. La Salle did not call the Mississippi the "St. Louis" (p. 46); he named it "Colbert ou Mississipi". The English Turn is not twenty-eight miles from the sea (p. 61), but twenty-eight leagues. Fort Louis was not moved up the river (p. 85), but down to the present site of Mobile. "Bernard de la Harpe" (p. 132) should be Bénard de la Harpe. The author charges Judge Martin with an error in the census of 1769 (p. 341), but the error occurs only in a wretched reprint of Martin's history, not in the original.

Aside from these slips, the author traces in a clear and interesting way the history of the Mississippi valley from the earliest Spanish discoveries down through the Revolution of 1768. The chapter on the Spanish period, being merely an introduction, might with advantage have been much abridged. In the political history the author goes over ground already trodden by many authors, particularly by Winsor, *The Mississippi Basin*. By American readers, therefore, much of the

book may be read in a cursory manner, and even Germans will doubtless feel like skipping the rather long account of Law's financial machinations in France, the details of which hardly find their proper place in this volume. If the author, however, has occasionally lost his sense of proportion, he is to be praised for recognizing the importance of the European background, and for explaining with commendable clearness the events that influenced history on this side of the Atlantic.

The most satisfactory and valuable portion of Dr. Franz's work is that in which he discusses the economic conditions that prevailed in the Mississippi valley during the period of French colonization, and the causes of the failure of France to make that valley as prosperous as it became under the American flag. This was the special task that the author set before himself, and here he has met with marked success. The reviewer does not know of any other work that presents the facts so forcibly, or analyzes the causes of failure in so scientific a spirit. His keen criticism of the attempts to rehabilitate the reputation of Kerlerec, for example (pp. 278-279), is very refreshing: "Nicht Sieg oder Niederlage bedingen den geschichtlichen Ruhm, wohl aber das kühne Ringen um ein hohes Ziel oder das tapfere Ausharren bei einer dem Untergange geweihten Sache!—Und finden wir solches bei Kerlérec?"

In explaining the causes of failure (pp. 426-427) the author very happily calls Louisiana "eine französische Kleruchie, d. h. eine Gründung der französischen Regierung, zugleich aber auch eine kanadische Apökie, d. h. eine private Schöpfung kanadischer Waldläufer." In fact France wished to increase the number of the royal provinces, to keep out the English, to secure the trade with the Spanish colonies, but she was not fitted to take advantage of the great opportunities that Louisiana presented as an agricultural region. She seized a larger territory than she could utilize: "Mal étreint qui trop embrasse". The whole system of colonization collapsed when it met as a rival the English, who, says Dr. Franz, "colonized not with the sword but with the plow".

Yet the labors of France in Louisiana were not without benefit to the world. Her occupation of the valley, says the author, was a period of preparation. In fact the mission of France, as the reviewer once heard M. Jusserand remark, has been that of "a sower of seed". Too often the harvest has been reaped by other nations, but her sowers were the brilliant pioneers, La Salle, Tonti, Iberville, and Bienville, who will always fill a large place in history.

The book contains a copy of Bellin's map of 1744 and a good bibliography, but no index.

JOHN R. FICKLEN.

The Ohio River: a Course of Empire. By ARCHER BUTLER HULBERT. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1906. Pp. xiv, 378.)

THE fresh appreciation of the geographical relationships of American history which has been in evidence in recent years has had the inevitable result of accentuating an important type of our current historical literature. The memory of man runneth not back to the day when we have not been deluged with local and regional histories, and yet it must be said that, for reasons which are more or less obvious, it is just this sort of historical writing which has fallen farthest short of its possibilities in this country. Happily there are at present not a few reasons for believing that we are on the eve of a distinct advance in this particular, marked not by a mere multiplying of books but by more intensive study of social and economic backgrounds in individual localities combined with (and that is the vital thing) a broader sweep and a firmer grasp on the conditions and developments of the country and of the world at large. We have yet hardly got beyond the age of the "popular" local history, but the species is improving and, whatever results we may sometime attain in the way of critical local studies, we shall never reach the point, as indeed we ought not, where a really good popular history is not worth while.

A book of this kind is Professor Hulbert's *The Ohio River*, published recently in the Messrs. Putnam's interesting series on the great river-basins of North America. Professor Hulbert's studies of the geographical background of early Western history, particularly the "Historic Highways", are well known and have equipped him, if not for adding new information, at least for the retelling of old facts from a somewhat novel point of view and with a very desirable freshness and vigor. The task undertaken in the present volume has been to describe the Ohio River as an avenue of national expansion—as a "course of empire"—and to sketch with some fullness the peopling of the great area to which the river and its tributaries for many decades afforded the readiest means of access. The project involved the rehearsal of a large amount of familiar history, but it also gave opportunity for the emphasizing of some things not so well known and the correcting of a number of erroneous impressions which still linger with regard to the settlement of the Middle West. By far the most valuable portions of the book are those which deal with the distinctly human side of the subject—the conditions of pioneer existence with which the emigrant had to wrestle, the life of flatboatman and trader, the reign of outlaw and rowdy, the intermingling of racial elements, and particularly the jealous contact of Yankee and Virginian on the north and south banks of the river. So far as political history is concerned, the student will find nothing new. But there is a sufficient contribution to our knowledge of the physical and social elements in the subject to give the book at least a reasonable right to existence.

Nowhere, except perhaps in the author's *Waterways of Westward Expansion* in the Historic Highways series, will one find so full and satisfactory treatment of the conditions and means of navigation on the Ohio from the eighteenth century to the present, covering the age of the canoe, of the flatboat, of the steamboat, and of the steel barge, and not neglecting the activities of the government since 1825 for the improvement of the river's channel. Particularly interesting is the account of the brig and schooner building in the period 1800-1809, when Ohio valley promoters were for the time bent upon the romantic project of establishing direct commercial intercourse with the West Indies and Europe.

The book is unfortunately subject to the limitations and defects of a hasty and somewhat scrappy narrative. It abounds in lengthy quotations, of which those coming from early writers and first-hand observers are clearly apropos, while the utility of those from Roosevelt, Venable, and other recent authors is at least open to question. There is a tendency at times to state things rather more broadly than the authenticated facts warrant. For example, is it not a little too much to say that "There is no question but that the brave La Salle discovered La Belle Rivière of New France (the Allegheny and Ohio) about 1670" (p. 18)? The probability of the discovery is strong, but after all it is only a probability. And does not the statement that "Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century there was continual fighting between the French on the St. Lawrence and the colonists in New England" (p. 19) convey an erroneous impression?

The work is richly illustrated and for the most part with very desirable effect. But one cannot refrain from expressing regret that the process of "padding" which, we may presume, is more or less inevitable in a book of the kind, should have been carried so far as to obtrude cuts of the Carnegie Institute and the Phipps Conservatory into a really solid description of Pittsburgh a hundred years ago, and of the Louisville waterworks into a chapter on "Where Yankee and Virginian Met."

FREDERIC AUSTIN OGG.

Correspondence of William Pitt when Secretary of State with Colonial Governors and Military and Naval Commanders in America. Edited under the auspices of The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America by GERTRUDE SELWYN KIMBALL. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd. 1906. Two vols., pp. lxix, 445; xxiii, 502.)

It is perhaps singular that a century and a half should have elapsed before the student had access, in convenient form, to the correspondence of the "Great Commoner", the man who at a critical moment became the head and heart of England in arms. And it is almost a matter of reproach to the sterner sex that the editing of documents

of such historical importance would still remain to be done, were it not for the energy and pure patriotism of the ladies of America. Every student of the eighteenth century should therefore feel grateful to Miss Kimball and to the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America for the publication of these two excellent volumes.

The purpose of the collection, as outlined in the introduction—in itself a scholarly piece of work—is to present in chronological order all that is of historical importance in the correspondence of William Pitt with the colonial governors and naval and military commanders, on the continent of North America and in the West Indies, during those years in which he held the position of secretary of state." This period covers scarcely four years of the career of the great statesman; but nevertheless within that space of time the political course of Europe was changed, the power of France in North America was crushed forever, and the United States became a possibility. For the people of this continent in particular, these letters are of absorbing interest because they permit one to follow stage by stage the development of the colonial policy of Britain and to trace in a measure the workings of the master mind and guiding hand. But since good judgment has been exercised in the selection of the documents and in the addition of useful notes, one would have wished that the earlier letters which throw light on the personality of Pitt could have been included. The measure of success, however, which will surely attend the present publication may induce Miss Kimball to continue her good work.

Pitt was the greatest orator of his day. The music of his eloquence compelled the admiration even of his critics. He was the man of whom England had need, the one man who, when her fortunes were at the lowest ebb, could restore her prestige with a single stroke and place her amongst the foremost nations of the world. These are facts which we recognize and admit; but still we marvel how it was all accomplished by one man, and a study of the letters before us will still leave one in doubt. Pitt was a skilful tactician. He controlled vast fleets and armies without interfering with them, and harmonized all the forces with which he had to deal by his policy. At the time when he began his administration in December, 1756, politics in England were of a low order; and although war had been officially declared between France and England six months before, no definite plan of campaign had been formulated and indeed the weak-kneed ministry had been averse to war. Pitt, while he maintained a high standard of personal honesty, did not hesitate to make use of men whose character he must have despised, and the compromise he effected in the spring of 1757 can be defended only on the ground that he saw in it a means of serving his country. But England and France had been at war in North America for several years before 1756. The French had possessed themselves by right of conquest of vast stretches of country which they might expect to hold by colonization, but which we know now they never could have so held. Bordering upon these lands for

thousands of miles were the settlements of the British people who came to stay, to make homes and seek more lands where and when they needed them. Alleged aggression and trespass on the one hand and alleged interference on the other soon occasioned collisions and conflicts; local in their character at first, but gradually assuming serious proportions, while each country was preparing for the more serious fray. At last the stronger nation, stronger at sea as well as on land, stronger in her institutions and in her material resources, aroused herself under the influence of Pitt, who decided upon the conquest of Canada and found the men and the means to make it an accomplished fact.

Eighteen days after entering upon his duties, he gave an indication of his policy regarding North America. Writing to Lawrence on December 22, he said: "The Dangers to which North America stands exposed have determined the King to take vigorous and effectual Measures to stop the Progress of the Enemy, and to annoy them, if possible, in their own Possessions. It is therefore the King's Intention to cause a Squadron of Ships of War, together with a considerable Land Force, to proceed shortly to North America, whereof 2,000 Men will be forthwith sent to Halifax; and . . . that you do follow such Directions, as you shall receive from the Earl of Loudoun" (I. 1).

England was far less happy in the choice of her commander-in-chief than France. Loudoun, who had been appointed at the outbreak of the war, was no match for the brilliant and tactful Montcalm. He arrived in Albany two months after he was expected by his chief officers, Webb and Abercromby, and found a condition of affairs similar to those which Montcalm had experienced in Quebec—jealousy between colonials and regulars. Loudoun was a man of indecision, and never seemed able to decide upon any plan of attack, and much valuable time was consequently consumed. In June, 1757, with nearly 12,000 men before Louisbourg, he could not determine whether it were better to attack the place or return home. After spending a whole month in considering, or, as Lord Charles Howe said, "In keeping the courage of His Majesty's soldiers at bay, and in expending the nation's wealth in making sham battles and in planting cabbages", he returned to New York, having covered himself with ridicule and greatly amused the French. Pitt no doubt was disgusted, although he does not appear to have passed any comment on his action. On December 30, 1757, he wrote: "I am with Concern to acquaint Your Lordship, that the King has judged proper, that your Lordship should return to England: And His Majesty [has] been pleased to appoint Major General Abercromby to succeed your Lordship as Commander in Chief of the King's forces in America" (I. 133-134).

It was in Quebec, however, that Pitt expected to strike the blow which would decide the fate of New France; and after the operations of 1758, which had been so satisfactory to England and so disheartening to her rival, he was more determined than ever to humble France, rob her of her colonies, destroy her navy, capture her trade, and

settle the question of national supremacy. He did not see the ultimate result upon the aspirations of the Anglo-Saxon across the sea, which was so pronounced in 1776; but he saw that with the thousands of miles of frontier between the English and the French of America, with immediate contact down the Mississippi valley, there never would be peace until it was made by a decisive victory. The correspondence therefore of the minister with Wolfe, Saunders, Monckton, Murray, and Townshend concerning the expedition to the St. Lawrence, although much of it has been printed before, will be read again in these volumes with interest and profit, as it really forms a condensed history of the siege of Quebec.

Although the letters emanate from widely divergent places and embrace a variety of topics, Pitt seems never for one moment to have lost his grasp of the situation as a whole. At one time we find him instructing a governor as to the course he should pursue in his relations with the people, at another he is administering a rebuke, planning a campaign, or attending to the equipment of a vessel in its smallest detail. This careful attention to the minute details of his department had much to do, no doubt, with his successful administration of affairs so far removed from his personal supervision. For it is often the omission of apparent trifles that is responsible for the failure of great projects. Colbert in earlier days exercised a watchful, almost paternal care over the infant colony of New France, and it might prove a profitable study to institute a comparison between the two men in this respect. The letters may be read with special advantage by those who are taking up the study of the campaigns of 1756-1760, and they are full of interest to the average reader, since they contain much of the thought of the greatest statesman England can claim for three hundred years. The books are well printed and are unusually free from typographical errors, although there are one or two slight topographical slips in the volumes, such as placing Bic off the Saguenay River.

The Navy of the American Revolution: Its Administration, its Policy, and its Achievements. By CHARLES OSCAR PAULLIN, Ph.D. (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company. 1906. Pp. 549.)

AFTER reading Dr. Paullin's book carefully I am inclined to think that he has in his preface written the best possible review of his own book. As to criticism, he has so carefully guarded himself, by accurate, scholarly methods of work, against the critics, that those "cut-throat bandits in the path of fame" get little opportunity for attack. It is in fact a masterly little book, well conceived, thoroughly studied, and judiciously written. It is a real contribution to the study of the American Revolution.

As Dr. Paullin says, the book is written from the point of view of the naval administrators, and not from that of the naval officers. It is

not chiefly concerned with doings at sea, details of fights, and movements of armed vessels, but seeks rather to tell us of the naval administrative machinery of the Revolution—the origin, organization, and work of naval committees, secretaries of marine, navy boards, and naval agents. The creation of the American navy was not merely a nailing and matching of boards and making of sails, but the creating after older models of an entirely new body of laws and regulations. Any sort of an attempt in this review to outline that legislation as described by Mr. Paullin would be inadequate. In addition to this there is a brief summary of legislation with reference to prize-courts and privateering. The emphasis has been placed upon the naval policy of the administrators, with a description of the various classes of naval movements, showing the total result, with details only in the case of a few typical cruises and fights. In this effort the dramatic quality of the exploit has not been allowed to fix the amount of detail used, and Paul Jones gets his due, while other, neglected, officers are given a more suitable mention than older historians have given them. The result is a much better balanced narrative, and a unity utterly lacking in older treatments. As dramatic historical literature the book suffers, but as a scientific study of an institution its value is vastly enhanced.

Perhaps the most instructive chapter in the book is that on "The Conditions of the Continental Naval Service". Not only in New England, but in the Middle and Southern colonies also, commerce and ship-building were important industries. Indeed Virginia during the Revolution put more naval ships afloat than any other colony. In spite of these maritime interests, it was the lack of sailors that constituted the chief obstacle to the success of the Continental navy. It was forced to spend most of its days in port vainly trying to enlist seamen. Much of this was due to the seductive allurements of privateering. Privateersmen paid higher wages than either Congress or the states, and, moreover, the business was often so lawless as to have all the excitement and profit of piracy. Not a few of the failures of the Continental navy, writes Mr. Paullin, are to be laid at the door of the Yankee privateersman. Nevertheless these hardy fellows supplied a large part of the sinews of war to both army and navy, though they made Congress pay a good round price.

The most original portion of the book is that part (162 pages) dealing with the state navies. Massachusetts had a fleet of sixteen armed vessels. Virginia had about fifty vessels, but poorly equipped. Nine of the states had such navies, but of this total force only about sixty vessels were adapted to deep-sea navigation. These might have aided Congress's Marine Committee, but expeditions concerted with them proved disappointing. Subordination could not be obtained. "The commander of a state vessel or the master of a privateer, for aught either could see, subtended as large an angle in maritime affairs, as an officer of Congress, which body was to them nebulous, uncertain, and irresolute" (p. 153). A special chapter is devoted to the navies

of each of the states of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and South Carolina; while two chapters are given to the minor navies of the Northern and Southern states. It is an interesting fact that these individual states had as elaborate machinery for controlling their navies as did the Continental Congress—naval boards, commissioners of the navy, and boards of war. There was also elaborate naval legislation, and admiralty courts not always amenable to the regulations proposed by Congress.

The book contains a most useful table of contents, a fine index, and a valuable bibliography of manuscript as well as of printed sources. An appendix contains a list of commissioned officers in the navy and marine corps, and a list of armed vessels in the service of the United States during the Revolution.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Vida de Herrán. Biografía escrita por EDUARDO POSADA y PEDRO M. IBÁÑEZ y premiada en el Concurso del Centenario. [Biblioteca de Historia Nacional, III.] (Bogotá: Imprenta Nacional. 1903. Pp. 477.)

Los Comuneros. *El Vasallo Instruido*, por J. DE FINESTRAD. *El Comercero Galán*, por A. M. GALÁN. *Reseña Zipaquireña*, por L. ORJUELA. *Los Comuneros de Neiva y Los Llanos. Apéndice.* [Biblioteca de Historia Nacional, IV.] (Bogotá: Imprenta Nacional. 1905. Pp. xvi, 453.)

THE *Biblioteca de Historia Nacional*, an undertaking of Señores Eduardo Posada and Pedro M. Ibáñez, is designed to provide a collection of inedited and rare materials and monographs on the history of Colombia, principally in the nineteenth century. Volume I. (Bogotá, 1902) contains, under the title *La Patria Boba*, three inedited documents of considerable interest: *Tiempos Coloniales*, by J. A. Vargas Jurado (a chronological history from 1714 to 1764 by a contemporary); *Libro de varias noticias particulares que han sucedido en esta capital de Santa Fé de Bogotá . . . desde el año de 1743*, by José María Caballero (Bogotá, September, 1813); and *Poema que contiene la historia de la entrada del tirano Simón Bolívar, y establecimiento del titulado Congreso en esta capital del Nuevo Reino de Granada, con noticia de su libertad por las victoriosas armas del Rey Nuestro Señor*, by D. José Antonio de Torres y Peña, Cura de Tabio, 1816 (pp. 275-476). Volume II. consists of documents, in the main inedited, relative to the life and career of Nariño, with an introduction and a few foot-notes. The title of the volume is: *El Precursor: Documentos sobre la Vida Pública y Privada del General Antonio Nariño* (Bogotá, 1903).

The subject of volume III., Pedro Alcántara Herrán, lived 1800-1872, is one of the most prominent figures in Colombian history. He joined the revolutionary forces in 1814 and by 1828 had risen to the rank of general, doing service under both Sucre and Bolívar. He was minister of war in 1830; military governor of Panama, 1836-1837; minis-

ter of interior and foreign affairs, 1837-1839; suppressed the insurrection of Pasto, 1840; was president of New Granada, 1841-1845; was three times minister to the United States, 1847-1849, 1855-1859, and 1861; and was on various occasions commander-in-chief, senator, and deputy. His career thus extended through all five stages of Colombian history, from the war of independence to the organization of the United States of Colombia in 1863. The present biography, constructed from the sources, gives a clear account of his life and of the principal events in which he figured, and is notably free from exaggerations and declamation. Nearly one-half the volume is devoted to *pièces justificatives*.

The fourth volume deals with the revolt of the Comuneros in 1781, which together with the insurrection of Tupac Amaru in Peru in the same year, marks the first assertion on the part of the creoles of their political rights, and was the forerunner of the revolution for independence. The first half of the volume consists of an inedited narrative of rare interest written in the year 1783 by the capuchin Joaquín de Finestrada; the second piece is an account, with documents, of the career of José Antonio Galán (1749-1782), one of the leaders of the revolt, by the late Colombian historian, Señor Angel M. Galán; the third is a history of the events in the commune of Zipaquirá based on original materials; the rest of the volume (pp. 363-449) contains a number of original documents. The introduction to the volume is excellent. The contents of the four volumes which have been briefly recited attest the exceptional interest of the series as a whole, and Señores Posada and Ibáñez have proved themselves not only judicious editors but competent historians as well.

LUIS M. PÉREZ.

The First Forty Years of Washington Society. Edited by GAILLARD HUNT. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1906. Pp. xii, 424.)

MR. HUNT has made an interesting selection from the correspondence of Margaret Bayard Smith, the wife of Samuel Harrison Smith of Philadelphia, who came to Washington, D. C., in 1800 and established the *National Intelligencer*. Mr. Smith was appointed by Madison in 1813 the first Commissioner of the Treasury Department and was from 1809 to 1819 President of the Bank of Washington and later President of the Branch Bank of the United States. The letters in this volume, with a few exceptions, were written by Mrs. Smith to members of her family, and cover the period from shortly after her arrival in Washington, in the latter part of 1800, to within a few years of her death, which occurred in January, 1844. Mrs. Smith wrote freely of persons and events, and during her more than forty years of residence in Washington she had unusual opportunities of becoming intimately acquainted with many of those most prominent in social life.

These letters illustrate forcibly that for the first thirty years there was but one social circle in Washington, and that dominated by those in political life. The Capitol was the meeting-place for society people.

Mrs. Smith mentions (p. 94) that "The house of representatives is the lounging place of both sexes" and refers to "the female crowd who throng the [Supreme] court room" (p. 96). During the celebrated debate between Webster and Hayne, Mrs. Smith writes that "the Senators were obliged to relinquish their chairs of State to the fair auditors" and that "there were 300 ladies besides their attendant beaux on the floor of the Senate". The stand taken against Mrs. Eaton, and Jackson's failure to secure the desired social recognition for her, are referred to and show clearly the strength of a single and united society; but the contest began the breach which destroyed this unity, for since that time there has gradually developed a number of social circles such as the Ultra Fashionable, Diplomatic, Army and Navy, Political, Old Resident, etc., which, although overlapping to some extent, are separate and distinct.

Mrs. Smith describes with particularity the social life of the city, the entertainments and the varieties of refreshments served, and many of her intimate friends, which places the reader in the social atmosphere of the time. An interesting account is given of Mrs. Madison and the first inaugural ball, also glimpses into the family life of the Wirts, Clays, Calhouns, Crawfords, and others. Among the foreigners described are Mrs. Merry, who rebelled against Jefferson's "pell mell" order, and Harriet Martineau. The account of the latter and the dinner given to her by Mrs. Smith is one of the features of the book.

These letters are especially interesting to the student of American history for the descriptions of Jefferson and Madison. Although Mrs. Smith's father, Colonel John Bayard, was a Federalist and prior to meeting Jefferson she had believed him "an ambitious and violent demagogue, coarse and vulgar in his manners, awkward and rude in his appearance" (p. 6), she became an ardent admirer of him and later an intimate friend. A letter from Jefferson to her stating his religious views is included in the volume. Mrs. Smith visited both Montpelier and Monticello and gives a detailed and entertaining account of the home life at these places.

Mrs. Smith's description of the destruction of Washington by the British, although graphic, is not that of an eye-witness. She left the city on the approach of the enemy, but returned immediately after they had retired, and gives a vivid picture of the ruined buildings and the gloom and depression of the citizens. The well-known story that Mrs. Madison, on leaving the White House, cut the Stuart portrait of Washington from the frame to save it from destruction by the British is shown to be without foundation, as Mrs. Smith writes that Mrs. Madison told her she found the picture in the possession of some men in Georgetown, when retreating with the "flying army".

The book is attractively gotten up and has a number of illustrations of the prominent people and places mentioned in the letters. The editor has furnished a satisfactory index and the notes necessary to explain the text.

MONTGOMERY BLAIR.

Coleccion de Historiadores i de Documentos relativos a la Independencia de Chile. Vols. IX.-XIV. (Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Cervantes. 1903-1905. Pp. x, 424; vii, 384; 353; ix, 423; vi, 418; vi, 345.)

THE present collection is really a continuation of the *Coleccion de Historiadores de Chile y Documentos relativos a la Historia Nacional* (Santiago de Chile, 1861-1902; 29 vols.), published under the direction of Diego Barros Arana. That collection made accessible the texts of the early voyagers and chroniclers and a number of important inedited documents for the history of Chile prior to the wars of independence. It was supplemented by the *Coleccion de Documentos Inéditos para la Historia de Chile desde el Viaje de Magallanes hasta la Batalla de Maipo*, 1518-1818, collected and published by J. T. Medina (Santiago de Chile, 1888-1901; 29 vols.). The present collection provides the materials for the period of the war of independence. The contents of vols. I.-VI. may be found in Anrique and Silva's *Ensayo de una Bibliografía Histórica i Jeográfica de Chile* (Santiago de Chile, 1902), p. 55. Of the present volumes, nos. IX. and X. consist of private and official letters and reports, of the years 1810-1820, in the main inedited, throwing light on the revolutionary events of those years. Volume XI. is a reprint of chapters VII.-XV. of José Rodríguez Ballesteros, *Revista de la Guerra de la Independencia de Chile desde 1813 hasta 1826* (Santiago, 1851). Chapters I.-VI. were issued as volume V. of the series. The edition of 1851 contained glaring typographical errors and inaccuracies (Brisefio, *Estadística Bibliográfica de la Literatura Chilena*, I. 514); and the present one was no doubt made therefore from the original manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional of Santiago. In volume XII. there appears the reprint of a pamphlet containing a violent denunciation of the public conduct of the Grand Marshal of Peru Don Bernardo O'Higgins: *Carta a los Editores de "El Mercurio" de Valparaiso sobre su Número 1332 i Otros Particulares, por Cárlos Rodríguez* (Lima, 1833; 38 pages). The editors speak of it as "one of the most inflammatory, most scandalous, most gross, and most unfounded libels which have ever profaned the art of printing" (p. 110). Together with this they reprint the defense made on behalf of O'Higgins: *Acusacion pronunciada ante el Tribunal de Jurados de Lima por el Doctor Don Juan Ascencio contra el "Alcance al Mercurio Peruano" publicado por Don Cárlos Rodríguez . . .* (Lima, 1833). Both documents, but especially the latter, contain many interesting details for the history of Chile and some important documents. Volume XIII. consists of a reprint of the translation made at Valparaiso, 1860, of the first volume of the memoirs of Lord Cochrane, *Narrative of Services in the Liberation of Chili, Peru and Brazil from Spanish and Portuguese Domination* (London, 1859 [1858], 2 vols.). Of this first volume there exist also two other Spanish translations, one printed at London, 1859, and the other at Paris, 1863. Another vindication of O'Higgins, against Rodríguez's

libel, consisting of a series of articles published in *El Araucano* of Santiago (January 24 to July 4, 1834, nos. 176-199) by Don Manuel José Gandarillas, goes to make up volume XIV. of the series. Many original documents exceedingly valuable to the historian were inserted in these articles.

Each volume in the series is provided only with a brief introduction and an occasional foot-note, but the aim of the publishers is simply to make accessible in convenient form the scattered historical material for the period, and for this every student will be grateful. The volumes are well printed, but they are not supplied with alphabetical indexes. The editors however will no doubt at the close print a complete alphabetical index to all the volumes, without which half the usefulness of the collection will be lost to students.

LUIS M. PÉREZ.

Lincoln the Lawyer. By FREDERICK TREVOR HILL. (New York: The Century Company. 1906. Pp. xviii, 332.)

THIS is a book which would be interesting to any one; to a lawyer its interest is absorbing. In a manner and to a degree not attempted by any other biographer of Lincoln, Mr. Hill undertakes to determine and estimate Lincoln's character as a lawyer, and especially to point out, if not to emphasize, the extent to which his career as President was influenced by his experience and training at the bar. In the first direction Mr. Hill has undoubtedly rendered a conspicuous and important service. In a picturesque and graphic manner he portrays the social and economic conditions of the country, and the character of the bench and bar of Illinois, when Lincoln was admitted to the ranks of the profession in 1836. From that time Mr. Hill, with a sympathy and an insight inspired by his own professional experience, traces Lincoln's progress as a lawyer through a period of twenty-three years until, by the loyal and untiring support of his professional associates, "the leader of the Illinois bar and the idol of the Eighth Circuit" was declared the choice of the Republican convention at Chicago.

When we take into consideration the nature of Mr. Lincoln's legal training and the circumstances and conditions under which he practised; when we have made allowances for his numerous digressions into the field of politics, we cannot fail to be impressed with the conviction that his career as a lawyer was not only a creditable but a remarkable one. Thus in 1845—nine years after his admission to the bar—Lincoln appeared in twenty-three cases before the Supreme Court of Illinois. In the same year, for example, Lyman Trumbull—who, however, was admitted one year later than Lincoln—had nine cases. "In his twenty-three years at the bar," says Mr. Hill (pp. 248-250), "Lincoln had no less than one hundred and seventy-two cases before the highest court of Illinois, a record unsurpassed by his contemporaries; he appeared before the United States circuit and district courts with great frequency; he was the most indefatigable attendant on the Eighth

Circuit and tried more cases than any other member of that bar; he was attorney for the Illinois Central Railroad, the greatest corporation in the State, and one which doubtless had its choice of legal talent; he was also counsel for the Rock Island Railroad, and other corporations and individuals with important legal interests at stake; he was sought as legal arbitrator in the great corporation litigations of Illinois and he tried some of the most notable cases recorded in the courts of that State."

Mr. Hill devotes his final chapter to "Lincoln, the Lawyer, as President", and it is in this chapter, of course, that the chief interest of the non-professional reader lies. It reads more like an after-dinner speaker's response to a toast than like sober history. Its estimates of men and measures are often exaggerated, but it serves to emphasize the fact that among the many influences which helped to mold Mr. Lincoln's character as President, his long and varied experience at the bar in Illinois was one of the most conspicuous and important.

The mechanical execution of the book is excellent, and a profusion of interesting illustrations, many of them new, adds greatly to its attractiveness.

FLOYD R. MECHEM.

The American Nation: a History. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART. Volume 17. *Westward Extension, 1841-1850.* By GEORGE PIERCE GARRISON, Ph.D., Professor of History, University of Texas. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1906. Pp. xiv, 366.)

THE fifth decade of the last century was truly, as the editor of this series suggests, a "stirring period" in American history. It has been Professor Garrison's task to describe the administrations of Tyler and Polk as an epoch essentially complete in itself and markedly differentiated in spirit from the Jacksonian era which preceded, and from the ante-bellum period proper which followed it. Such an undertaking is not easy, for the period of the forties has usually been treated as a series of episodes in the history of the slavery question or as a prologue to that of secession and the Civil War. The difficulties surrounding the subject are not lessened by the fact that the volume is one of a series the dominant note of which is professedly national. If one were to write with an eye to the results of the great events of this decade, the growth of sectionalism rather than of nationalism might be stressed. The period was one of expansion, and Professor Garrison's thesis is that this expansion was the outcome of a national and not merely of a sectional sentiment; that the growing importance of the slavery question for a long time hindered rather than hastened it. The result of Professor Garrison's labors is a volume conceived in a spirit of fairness and executed with discriminating judgment.

The two principal characters of the period were, of course, the two

Presidents, Tyler and Polk; Tyler, the "accidental President", "the man without a party", and Polk, styled by Alexander H. Stephens as "the mendacious". That Tyler was a man of spirit and of firmness (or even of stubbornness) will not be denied, but remembering, for instance, that he was fairly dragooned by McDuffie into appointing Calhoun as Secretary of State, the author's statement that he was "a brave and determined man", "actuated in the main by courage and consistency" (p. 65) seems rather strong. Again, Polk is described as a man of "stern integrity and strength of . . . character", who had "sincere faith in the righteousness of his own purposes and of the means he used to attain them" (p. 207). The basis for this judgment is Polk's diary, and it must, therefore, be taken somewhat upon faith. That a reading of the diary points to the strict integrity of this President is a matter for such a difference of opinion that only the printing of the manuscript can determine it. Polk's relations with Santa Anna in 1846 give evidence of his aptitude for indirect and even for conscienceless official scheming, if they do not raise questions of his personal integrity. The whole decade was one in which the politician rather than the statesman directed the policies of the government. It is true, as the author states, that no one "would be willing to see his [Polk's] work undone" (p. 207), even if the methods employed to accomplish the result were condemned. But if these methods were improper and the motives unworthy, those who were responsible for them are to be judged without reference to results. For example, the diary shows that Polk was engaged in writing a war message against Mexico when he received news of the attack upon Taylor. This fortuitous occurrence was seized by the President to shift the burden of aggression upon Mexico. Polk's attitude toward Mexico prior to the outbreak on the Rio Grande is therefore the key to his motives and methods in the conflict which gave to the United States its great expansion to the Pacific.

This volume, taking westward extension as its theme, centres around the three great episodes of the decade: the annexation of Texas, the settlement of the northwestern boundary difficulty, and the Mexican War; and about one-half of the text is concerned with these subjects. The elections of 1840 and 1844, the quarrel of Tyler with the Whigs, the Ashburton treaty, the Walker tariff, and the independent treasury system receive as much attention as could be expected in a book of this size, and the treatment of each is adequate and clear. Some minor events, such as the Dorr rebellion (described in fourteen lines), are but touched upon. With the exception of the chapter upon the Wilmot Proviso, shown to be the rock upon which both great parties were to split, and that upon the election of 1848, the part of the volume which is devoted to the results of the Mexican War gives the impression of being unduly compressed. Possibly the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and certainly the compromise of 1850, were matters of such momentous national importance as to deserve more extended treatment in a vol-

ume of national history than the colonization and boundaries of Texas. This may be hypercriticism, for the admirable chapters upon Texas give so much important information not easily attainable elsewhere that one is glad to have them perhaps even at the expense of the other topics. There is, also, a lack of proportion in the treatment of the Mexican War. No attempt is made to describe in any detail the campaigns of Taylor and Scott. The events leading to hostilities, notably that of Slidell's mission in 1846, are set forth minutely and withal interestingly. Professor Garrison's familiarity with the Texan and Mexican archives is apparent in the fullness of his treatment of the Texas question. In his account of Polk's administration the invaluable diary of that President has been used to great advantage. References to it are frequent, and by it the causes of the Mexican War are shown in a new light. Polk determined to accomplish certain definite things, of which national extension to the Pacific was the most important. The author's use of Polk's diary shows how the programme was stubbornly and almost relentlessly carried out. The merit of this volume is the thoughtful and judicial treatment of a period of complicated political conditions and of problems new to the national life. If any fault is to be found with the book, it is in its lack of proportion. This, however, appears to be due rather to the plan of the work than to the author's execution of it.

JESSE S. REEVES.

The American Nation: a History. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART. Volume 18. *Parties and Slavery, 1850-1859.* By THEODORE CLARKE SMITH, Ph.D., Professor of American History in Williams College. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1906. Pp. xvi, 341.)

THE title of the book, *Parties and Slavery*, calls attention to the fact that during the decade preceding the Civil War party readjustment on account of the slavery question filled a prominent place. The volume is by no means limited, however, to the topics suggested by the title. Besides dealing with the various phases of party relations and the questions directly involved, the author gives chapters on political leaders, diplomacy, railroad-building, the panic of 1857, "Social Ferment in the North", and finally a critical essay on authorities. The text is illuminated by several maps. The book does not profess to be a complete history of the decade which it covers, since other volumes in the series deal with closely related subjects. There are only occasional references to the work of the abolitionists, for example, that topic being more fully treated in volume 16 of the series.

There is evidence of a large amount of thorough and conscientious work on the part of the author. Many illuminating passages have been culled from newspapers and other contemporary publications, and there is throughout a discriminating selection of materials. There is a re-

markable freedom from any appearance of prejudice or bias in favor of any particular theory or opinion. The two sides of the great controversy are set forth with justice and an even hand.

In all history opinions, sentiments, and beliefs hold a leading place. The historian who deals with political parties deals pre-eminently with that part of public opinion which is continually under controversy. Political parties are the organs for the formulation of conflicting opinions, and their consideration is therefore fraught with peculiar difficulties. The subject-matter itself forestalls agreement. The historian, however thorough and impartial, is certain to advance opinions which others will not accept. To criticize in such a case is often simply to express a contrary opinion.

Comparing chapters II. and III. (in which the notion of the finality of the compromises of 1850 is discussed) with other parts of the book, one gets the impression that the idea of finality is over-emphasized. The author indeed supports his view by apt quotations from newspapers, from the speeches of statesmen, from the utterances of conventions and the results of elections; yet in these chapters no mention is made of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and its influence upon the general controversy. In an entirely different connection, on page 281, that work is mentioned, and we are told that "it achieved an unparalleled success from the start, edition after edition being absorbed by a public gone wild over the humor and the tragedy of the work." This was the situation at the time when the doctrine of the finality of the compromises was being assiduously preached, and a public gone mad over *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was not in a state of mind to accept the Fugitive-Slave Law as a final settlement of the national dispute.

Our author is eminently fair in his treatment of the South, though the parts of the book dealing with that section exhibit less complete information than do other portions. The union sentiment in the South is recognized, but not so fully as it deserves to be, while the anti-slavery sentiment which existed in the slave states is almost wholly ignored. Helper's *Impending Crisis* is disposed of in a few lines which describe the book as "an anomaly", and the statement is made that it entirely failed to turn the non-slaveholding whites against the slaveholders. Why did it fail? The book threw the slaveholding leaders into a frenzy. John Sherman, when candidate for the speakership of the House of Representatives, was defeated because he had inadvertently lent his name to encourage its circulation. A Southern congressman declared that such a man was not only not fit for Speaker, he was not fit to live. Surely Southern slaveholders believed that *The Impending Crisis* would turn non-slaveholding whites against them if they should be allowed to read it.

These slight criticisms are intended rather to call attention to the difficulty which any author must encounter who writes on controversial politics than to characterize the work as a whole. The book is worthy of high commendation.

The American Nation: a History. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART. Volume 19. *Causes of the Civil War, 1859-1861.* By FRENCH ENSOR CHADWICK, Rear-Admiral U. S. N., recent President of the Naval War College. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1906. Pp. xiv, 372.)

THIS book falls into two parts. The first sixty-six pages contain a discussion of the general causes of the war. The first chapter, on the "Drift towards Southern Nationalization", works logically to the conclusion contained in its final sentence: "It was impossible for it [the South] to remain under a polity almost as divergent from its sympathies as the Russian autocracy of that period was from the United States of to-day" (p. 16). Chapter two discusses conditions in the South, chapter three the "Dominance of Calhoun's Political Conceptions", and chapter four the "Expectations of the South", particularly with reference to territorial expansion and the reopening of the slave-trade. These chapters show a wide reading and an acceptance of such views as have obtained general credit among the best historical students. Of course there are many subjects upon which, as yet, historians take position according to their birthplace, and of these it is sufficient to say that Admiral Chadwick was born in West Virginia and was graduated from Annapolis in 1864. Only, perhaps, his view of Calhoun deserves censure as unduly harsh.

The remaining chapters treat of the history of the country from and including the John Brown raid to the evacuation of Fort Sumter. Such an account naturally suggests comparison with the work of Mr. Rhodes. The number of words given to the period in the present volume is about three-fifths of that used by Mr. Rhodes. On the other hand, Admiral Chadwick devotes almost half as many again to the episodes of Forts Sumter and Pickens. This makes these episodes the leading feature of the volume, and the author makes it clear why he gives them this prominence. He pithily states the possibility that prompt action might have confined secession to South Carolina, but refuses to enter upon a discussion of this fascinating hypothesis. He points out the strategic importance of the coast forts, and the constitutional advantage which Lincoln derived from holding those that were left to him. He is, perhaps, a little more sharp in his criticism of President Buchanan than Mr. Rhodes, but there is here no material difference in their views. This is, however, the best picture which has ever been given of the general inefficiency of the government departments, extending into Lincoln's administration; neither Holt nor Anderson nor Scott escapes criticism, and Seward is severely castigated. The military and naval situation is presented with unusual clearness, and this whole portion of the book has the ring of a definitive account.

Admiral Chadwick is somewhat more severe in his personal judgments than Mr. Rhodes, particularly with regard to the Southern

leaders at Washington. Of Trescot he says, "That he should have been able to adjust his action to any known code of honor is one of the amazing characteristics of the situation" (p. 152). After the description of certain activities of Trescot, Floyd, and Thompson he says, "We have here a full conspiracy" (p. 158). Again, he contends that the meeting of the Southern senators on January 5, 1861, constituted a genuine conspiracy (pp. 242-245). He insists upon the point partly because he will not go so far as Mr. Rhodes in acknowledging that the extraordinary occasion excused unusual conduct (p. 242), and partly because he rates higher the influence of such leaders in determining the attitude of the South: "For throughout the South the movement at first was, in the main, one of the politicians and not of the people" (p. 149). "That the movement soon became a popular one is certain, but the extent of the domination of the politicians and the wide-spread ignorance of the people, the ease with which the feelings of an ignorant and impressionable population can be played upon, the willingness of men to have arms put into their hands to resent an injury or a supposed injury, the *ennui* of southern life, which caused a craving for excitement of any sort, can easily account for the readiness of the southern population, the step of secession once taken, to enroll itself in the military service of their states" (p. 150).

The treatment of the John Brown raid is chiefly noticeable because of the slight effect attributed to it. The campaign of 1860, the action of Congress, the secession of the Southern states, are rapidly surveyed; the development of Northern sentiment is neglected, perhaps left for the succeeding volume, but the attitude of Lincoln is sympathetically discussed. Errors are few. The statement as to the value of the hay crop in the map facing page 8, which is correct, does not agree with that of page 28; nor is proper allowance made for the fact that the hay crop was rather a burden than an asset to the North. On page 30 it is not quite clear how the figures have been obtained, but at any rate they are not consistent with each other; probably \$13,000,000 should be \$23,000,000. On page 100 it is evident that the author misunderstands the significance of the political term "non-interference." The coloring of the map opposite page 152 is incorrect in some particulars. "A majority of 10 in a total of 99" is impossible (p. 146). "Says", on page 231, should be "say".

The general equipment of the volume is like that of the others of this series. There are six maps, illustrating well-chosen points, and well constructed except the fifth, which deals with the election of 1860, a subject, perhaps, too complicated for graphic representation. The bibliography is well done, but is, perhaps, not so serviceable as a guide to the student as in some of the other volumes. The style is good; and though it occasionally runs into such barbarisms as "religiosity", it preserves on the whole an academic dignity and is clear, vigorous, and effective.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

Memoirs with Special Reference to Secession and the Civil War.

By JOHN H. REAGAN, LL.D. Edited by WALTER FLAVIUS McCALDER, Ph.D., with Introduction by Professor GEORGE P. GARISON. (New York and Washington: The Neale Publishing Company. 1906. Pp. 351.)

JOHN H. REAGAN, "a self-made man", who rose to high rank under the *ancien régime* in the South and who was a trusted adviser to Jefferson Davis, evidently experienced much that would not only interest the present generation, but add to the sum of our historical knowledge. Besides having passed through such crises as Texas annexation, the Mexican War, the compromise of 1850, and the Civil War, Reagan was a man of unusually clear vision, of absolute honesty and few abiding prejudices. He was, then, a man who ought to have written his memoirs; and there was double incentive in his own case because he was for a long time the last living member of the Confederate cabinet, and he realized the ever-growing interest in the events of the war.

But the book itself is short, embracing but three hundred and fifty pages of not very compact print. The main topics treated are the writer's early life in Texas, his part in Congress during three or four years prior to 1861, the organization of the Confederacy at Montgomery, the Civil War, as viewed by an active and efficient cabinet officer in Richmond, and the problems of reconstruction. The most interesting portion of the book is the plain, unvarnished story of Reagan's hardships and early struggles. He does not blush to tell of his experience as an overseer in Mississippi and to note without concern that he thought it a promotion to be raised from the position of teacher to that of overseer. His frank statements about himself lend weight to his opinions about Davis, Lee, and others with whom he later came into daily contact. The fact that such a man could rise to fame in the South and become the trusted companion of the men who made the Confederacy shows how open was the rank of Southern aristocracy.

Reagan defends Davis against Joseph E. Johnston, Beauregard, and Alexander Stephens, and takes the ground that no better or abler leader could have been found. If there are men who still regard the Confederate President as having been tyrannical, unfeeling toward his own people, and cruel to Northern prisoners, they will have to stiffen their backs a little after reading Reagan's account of the cabinet meeting in which the policy of retaliation for Dahlgren's raid was discussed. The cabinet was unanimously in favor of ordering a number of Federal prisoners shot. Davis declined to act on this advice, saying that he opposed shooting unarmed men on any consideration, that the place for such work was on the field of battle (p. 182).

But Reagan's best service to the people of Texas and indirectly to the South was his brave efforts to persuade them, from his cell in

Fort Warren in August, 1865, to accept the results of the war without resistance and meet conservative opinion in the North half-way on the subject of negro enfranchisement. To do this he ran the risk of being declared "reconstructed" and of losing his wide popularity. He took the stand, however, in what was known as his Fort Warren letter, that the better class of negroes should be permitted to vote, that ignorant and propertyless whites and blacks should alike be disfranchised, and that the Southern states should co-operate cordially with President Johnson in re-establishing federal relations. This letter brought to its author unlimited abuse, and for a time every politician considered it his especial duty to malign and ridicule the former Samson whose locks had been shorn by the modern Delilah. Ere ten years elapsed the Fort Warren prisoner was seen to have been the best counsellor of his time.

The last hundred pages of the *Memoirs* consist of appendixes giving reprints of Reagan's more important speeches in Congress and his invaluable public letters of 1865 and 1866. The editing of the work has been very well done.

While this book tells us a great deal that deserved to be recorded and confirms much that was not quite certain without this evidence, it does not give all or even most of the real experience of its author. The most difficult thing in the world for a writer of memoirs is to forget himself and tell truths in the interest of history that might pain people whom he loves. For the noble reticence of great men on subjects of this kind the world may be thankful and historians possibly not unthankful. In this respect Reagan is like most of his predecessors; and some very interesting things which he alone knew are buried with him.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the Final Restoration of Home Rule at the South in 1877. By JAMES FORD RHODES, LL.D., Litt.D. Volume VI., 1866-1872; Volume VII., 1872-1877. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1906. Pp. xx, 440; xiii, 431.)

To the ten years following 1866 Mr. Rhodes has given two volumes. Neither of these, however, is much more than two-thirds the length of their immediate predecessor, the bulky volume V. One cannot help wondering, therefore, why chapter 30, introducing Reconstruction, was put in that volume, which was already quite long enough, and which would so much more naturally have ended with the end of the Civil War. In the recasting which the entire work will doubtless have some day, one of the changes should be the transfer of that chapter to volume VI. Volume VI. could then spare some of its matter to volume VII., which, even with the long general index, is shorter than the average.

The new (or, rather, completed) title under which the two volumes appear would seem to indicate that the entire work is completed; and in a preface to volume VI. Mr. Rhodes explains that, after reflection, the year 1877, marking the end of "carpet-bag" rule in the South, has seemed to him a more natural stopping-place than the year 1885, which, as witnessing the inauguration of the first Democratic President since the war, he had originally chosen for his bourne. But the language of the preface implies that he may, after still more reflection, and after some special preparation, decide to address himself to the new themes which, from 1877 on, overshadow the sectional controversy. With that, in one form or another, he has been dealing ever since he began to write—now nineteen years ago. In a foot-note to volume VII., p. 17—possibly left there by an inadvertence—he in fact definitely promises to treat a certain topic more fully "in a future volume". It is characteristic of Mr. Rhodes that the special preparation which he thinks he needs for going on should be nothing less than "a systematic study of the history of Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries" (VI. vi). He fears that his long absorption in a particular period of our history, which takes its quality from a single movement, may have narrowed the range of his vision; and he wishes to have, in his study of more recent years, during which we have dealt with a different set of problems, whatever enlightenment one may get from the experience of European countries.

Be that as it may, whether it shall prove that the laying aside of his pen is final or only for a breathing-spell, he has chosen a good time to pause from his labors. For in 1877, with the withdrawal of the Federal troops from the South, there does come a break, a turning of the current of affairs into a new channel, as clearly marked as any to be found in our history since the Revolution; it is doubtful if we ought to except even that other break with the past to which Mr. Rhodes had already come when he chronicled Lee's surrender. That marked only the downfall of the Confederacy and the end of slavery. In 1877 we reached the end of the entire period during which American political history was mainly an affair of North and South.

These two new volumes might, in fact, if they only included chapter 30, stand alone as an account of a period which is itself fairly well defined; well enough, at any rate, to have a clumsy name of its own—"the Reconstruction period". I am tempted to characterize Mr. Rhodes's treatment of it by paraphrasing a remark which, two years ago, in this REVIEW, I was moved to make concerning his treatment of what came before. As in volume V. he finished what is on the whole our best history of the Civil War, so in volume VII. he has finished the best history yet written of Reconstruction. Unfortunately, however, the superlative does not in this second instance convey nearly so high praise as in the first. There exist several reasonably good histories of the war, but until these two volumes appeared there was no work covering

the period of Reconstruction which could be commended.¹ For trustworthy material concerning it one had to go to the documents and other original sources, to memoirs and biographies, and to monographs which deal, as a rule, only with individual states.

Mr. Rhodes's account of these years suffers—as any narrative of the period must—from the necessity he is under, more and more frequently as he goes on, to turn aside from his main theme to topics and episodes that have little or no connection with it. The new volumes suffer, too, by comparison with their more recent predecessors, for the want of a great central personality like Lincoln's. To some readers, no doubt, it will seem that they also suffer because their main theme is not so interesting as the war. But it is, at least, a less hackneyed theme; and one feels, moreover, that Mr. Rhodes is more at home in dealing with such political episodes and problems as he here encounters than he ever was in the military parts of his narrative. He is at his best when investigating and judging causes and men; not when he confronts the stirring scenes and occasions which a historian of a more artistic bent would welcome as opportunities.

His solution of the peculiarly difficult problem of order presented by his period is the simplest. Substantially, he follows the chronological order of events. He will, it is true, pursue a comparatively brief episode to its end, even though he must turn back for the beginning of the next, or to take up the broken thread of the main narrative. But he does not hesitate to break that thread. If, therefore, one would follow the course of Reconstruction uninterruptedly, one must skip certain chapters and considerable portions of others.

Mr. Rhodes has very positive views of his own about Reconstruction, and nowhere else in his entire work does he speak his mind more freely; not even when, in an earlier volume, he weighs and finds wanting all the South's apologies for "the cause". When he has followed the Reconstruction Acts of March, 1867, through the two houses of Congress, he declares (VI. 23) : "No law so unjust in its policy, so direful in its results had passed the American Congress since the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854." Nor does he spare the chief authors of the policy. "Stevens's declarations [concerning Southern outrages] are entitled", we are told (VI. 24), "to no credence. He hated the South and desired to crystallize his feeling of hatred into legislation." "Ostensibly in the interest of freedom", his policy was, in truth, "an attack on civilization" (VI. 35). Sumner, whose claim to the authorship of the provision for negro suffrage Mr. Rhodes concedes, is acquitted of vindictiveness, but convicted of egregious unwisdom in neglecting the central factor in the problem. On the vital question of race, he would have done well, Mr. Rhodes points out, to consult one of his most intimate friends; for as early as 1863 Alexander Agassiz,

¹ I do not think Professor W. A. Dunning's work, in "The American Nation" series, has yet seen the light. To that volume scholars interested in Reconstruction look forward with high expectations.

looking at the matter as a scientist, could find no good reasons to believe the negroes fit, and many reasons to believe them unfit, for the high privileges and duties of citizenship which it was now proposed to thrust upon them. When the whole wretched story of the dominance of the negro and the "carpet-bagger" has been told, Mr. Rhodes, so far from modifying his judgment, seems to be searching for stronger words in which to restate it. "No large policy in our country", he concludes, "has ever been so conspicuous a failure as that of forcing universal negro suffrage upon the South" (VII. 168).

He tells the story plainly and straightforwardly, as his wont is; mainly by the use of specific facts and episodes and instances; undramatically, and not without stiffness and clumsiness; but convincingly. One can hardly believe that it will not some day be told after a fashion that will take it into literature, but meanwhile no one need any longer neglect it for want of a trustworthy and not unreadable version. It is interesting to observe the writer's own deep interest in it, and the thoroughly human way in which, as he goes on, he finds himself more and more in sympathy with the Southern people; a sympathy which culminates in the approving citation of Senator Hoar's well-known tribute, and which is reflected in a striking phrase in the summing-up at the end of the book—"the oppression of the South by the North" (VII. 290). This is an attitude which is far less likely to provoke criticism at the North than it would have been ten years ago. At the South, one fancies, it may help to win for Mr. Rhodes's work an attention which its thoroughness and fairness ought to have won for it before.

But I have not meant to imply that the interest of these volumes all centres about Reconstruction. On the contrary, I incline to think those parts the most readable in which Mr. Rhodes turns northward, for episodes like the fight with Tweed in New York City; or westward, or to our foreign relations, or to unsectional political questions like those of finance and the tariff. I am decidedly of opinion that he does not turn westward often enough; that he makes too little of the resumption of the westward movement after the war. So far is he from giving to the building of the Union Pacific Railroad the epical character with which Robert Louis Stevenson and others have invested it that he tells the story of it only by way of explaining the Credit Mobilier scandals. The spreading of a network of railroads over the entire West, which followed hard upon the completion of the first transcontinental line, he discusses only as the chief cause of the panic of 1873. Less space is given to the westward movement in all its phases than to weighing the evidence for and against the integrity of James G. Blaine; and this, I think, is an instance of a distaste for economic history which may be set down as one of the author's limitations. It must be confessed, however, that the handling of the Blaine controversy is a most admirable instance of Mr. Rhodes's straightforwardness and firmness of hand. Admirable

also, and in the same way, is the chapter on the disputed election of 1876.

Some minuter criticisms suggest themselves. I think, for instance, that in the account of the final break between Grant and President Johnson, in 1867, Mr. Rhodes is far too lenient to Grant. Perhaps he has not seen a revival of that controversy in the *New York Herald* (May 27, 1878), and a contribution then made to it from the diary of Gideon Welles. But to mention such instances in which one dissents from Mr. Rhodes's views would be misleading. In a far greater number of instances, I feel sure, intelligent readers, particularly if they have some familiarity with his material, will find themselves sur-rendering preconceptions to accept his judgments.

There is nothing about these new volumes to suggest any fresh discussion of Mr. Rhodes's way of writing history. In style, they are uniform with their predecessors. It is true that I have twice, greatly to my surprise, detected Mr. Rhodes in something that looks decidedly like phrase-making. Grant, while President, accepts the gift of a horse and buggy "with oriental nonchalance". The city of Geneva is the "staid chamberlain of mighty issues" (VI. 375). But in general what has been said of the earlier volumes is as true of these. They have the same quality of heavy, awkward strength. There is the same absence of fine writing, and the same freedom from any striving after it; the same apparent disregard of form in paragraphs; rather more sentences than usual, perhaps, that are clumsy with a clumsiness which one perfectly understands, instead of being skilful with the kind of elaborate cleverness which one frequently fails to understand; and there is, if anything, an even heightened contempt for punctuation marks, particularly for the comma.

The index is by Mr. David M. Matteson.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

Four Centuries of the Panama Canal. By WILLIS FLETCHER JOHNSON. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1906. Pp. xxi, 461.)

A JOURNALIST'S history; so attested by the contents, the style, and even by the preface. Years of service as a newspaper correspondent have given Mr. Johnson much familiarity with the Isthmian Canal project during the past decade. It was a simple task to recast, recapitulate, "read up" the past, and make a history. If the book had been named according to its emphasis rather than according to the extreme limit of dates covered, it had better been called "*Four Years of the Panama Canal.*" The first 396 years are treated in the first third of the book, and the events of really less than four full years fill the remaining two-thirds.

Mr. Johnson made a book of what he knew, and in some cases of what he thought he knew. The mature, thorough, patient, scholarly historian has not yet busied himself with the Canal, or for that matter,

with Spanish America. When the patient student does consider the Canal, he will be like Mr. Johnson, in contact with a big field, tempting the writer to run far afield into the widely separated corners where lie the problems and the records of diplomacy, politics, international law, engineering, sanitation, and the geographic influences which have here held the affairs of man in a savage, ruthless, molding grip.

From all this activity, the one-volume writer must indeed choose, and it may be that Mr. Johnson has not wandered unnecessarily; but a perusal of the book calls to mind the fact that the journalist's field includes all that is interesting. That which was in its recent day good news or good "filler" for a metropolitan daily has gone into that part of the book dealing with the Panama Canal since the American government took active hold of the project. The other one-third of the book is a summary, an introduction, and in the choice of material one sometimes wonders; for example, why there should have been included a reproduction of a map of the world as conceived by Ptolemy. The interesting and spectacular thirty years' work of the French companies is dismissed with a brief thirty pages, including a chapter of analysis to show why they failed rather than what they did. The French period was followed by nearly a decade of American investigation and legislation. We sent commission after commission and had report after report, a large amount of congressional action, national ferment, and dickerings with the French company, and the final purchase of the French possessions by the United States government. This period the author covers in twenty-two pages. Apparently he was not journalistically connected at this time.

The author begins to expand the subject with the events of 1902. Here we see more traces of journalistic origin, for this is the time when Colombia began to lay plans for the capture of the canal millions, and thereby made what the newspapers called news and printed as such at great length. These iniquities are pointed out and the negotiations described in full. Then follows a full account of the Panama Revolution and of later Isthmian politics. The book might almost be called "The Politics and Administration of the Panama Canal since 1902," for the Colombian and Panama incidents are followed by an account of Taft's pacifying mission (of which party Mr. Johnson was a member) and of the turmoil at Washington over the details of administration and the problems of construction.

Evidently the author's turn of mind is more for politics than for engineering. There is a surprising paucity of engineering matter, and it is certainly to be hoped that the various political events upon which he poses as an authority are more correctly conceived in his mind than is the physical appearance of the Canal itself. He actually prints a full-page map of Panama and the Canal in which the canal is laid down according to old plans which were abandoned several years ago and therefore have no relation whatever to the canal which the

Commission is building. There is almost nothing of the economic or commercial aspects of the Canal.

Considerable space is given to description of the people, country, and climate of the little republic, and an appendix of forty-nine pages contains the text of treaties, proclamations, bills, etc. The book shows its newspaper origin by such glaring inaccuracies as those referred to above, by the fact that it comes quite down to the date of publication, by its newspaper English, and by its readability. It is interesting reading, and we need for easy consultation such an account of the origin and progress of the Panama Republic and its relations with the United States.

J. RUSSELL SMITH.

MINOR NOTICES

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, new series, volume XX. (London, Office of the Society, 7 South Square, Gray's Inn, W. C.). The presidential address by the Rev. Dr. William Hunt treats of the nature and claims of the study of history. In a valuable paper entitled "A Chapter in Roman Frontier History", Professor H. F. Pelham presents some of the results of the labors of the German Imperial Frontier Commission (*Reichslieries-Kommission*) revealing the successive stages in the extension of Roman control over the territory east of the Rhine; and the various measures employed for the defense of this territory. Sir Harry Poland gives the correct text (hitherto unpublished) of Mr. Canning's "Rhyming Despatch" to Sir Charles Bagot, and defends Canning against the charge of ill-timed frivolity. Dr. J. Holland Rose shows that the secret intelligence received by Canning from Tilsit and elsewhere from July 16 to 23, 1807, although not logically complete, had a cumulative force which will make us hesitate to censure Canning for basing thereon his policy of coercing Denmark. "The Northern Policy of George I. to 1718" is discussed by Mr. J. F. Chance, who has contributed several articles on various phases of this subject to the *English Historical Review*. Miss Violet Shillington traces "The Beginnings of the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance" from the twelfth to the end of the fifteenth century. In his paper on "The Study of Nineteenth Century History" Mr. Percy Ashley laments the neglect by English students and investigators of the recent history of European states, especially those of the continent. He urges the importance of the study and tries to show that neither the nature of the material nor the difficulty of "detachment" presents insuperable obstacles to its scientific investigation. The Rev. John Willcock's account of "Sharp and the Restoration Policy in Scotland" reaches conclusions very unfavorable to both objects of his inquiry. The Alexander Prize Essay, by Miss R. R. Reid, is an interesting study of the local causes and aspects of "The Rebellion of the Earls, 1569."

F. G. D.

Books, Culture and Character, by J. N. Larned (Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1906, pp. 187), is a compilation of public addresses delivered by the author. The work, being of a general nature, does not lend itself to exact analysis. Its purpose is to assist in the choice and use of books. Of its contents, the last chapter, and in all more than a fourth of the volume, are devoted to history, which is rated by Mr. Larned as the highest branch of the literature of knowledge, as distinguished from the literature of wisdom. Of historical works Mr. Larned discusses a list suitable for the general reader. In his concluding chapter he deprecates the present school-teaching of history with its formal questioning and periodical examinations. In place of this system he advocates a course of school-reading, judiciously selected from readable text-books and standard histories, along with a minimum of comment by the directing teacher.

On behalf of the American Library Association the Library of Congress has issued a *Portrait Index* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1906, pp. lxxv, 1601), edited by William Coolidge Lane, librarian of Harvard University, and Nina E. Browne, secretary of the Association's Publishing Board. In the compilation many librarians and others have co-operated. The index is intended more especially for use in libraries, publishing houses, and newspaper offices. It confines itself to portraits in books, periodicals, and published collections, the indexing of current periodicals extending in most cases to the end of 1904. Comprehended in the index are some one hundred and twenty thousand portraits of forty thousand persons contained in six thousand volumes. In general, genealogical works and local histories are not indexed. With few exceptions, all the portraits in any work indexed are included.

Ancient Sinope, by David M. Robinson, Ph.D., Associate in Classical Archaeology in the Johns Hopkins University, is a reprint (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1906, pp. 105) of articles in the *American Journal of Philology* and the *American Journal of Archaeology*. The work nevertheless forms a unit. It is based on Dr. Robinson's studies at the American School at Athens in 1902 and a visit by him to Sinope in 1903. The author discusses in turn the site, commerce, foundation, history, civilization, and cults of the city. Sinope was probably of Assyrian origin. Its name antedates the Greek settlement, and the Assyrian element continued in force down to the fourth century. By Greeks the city was twice colonized, from Miletos before 756 and again, after the Cimmerian invasion, from Attica about 630. The making of Sinope with its harbor, the best on the southern shore of the Pontus. The importance of the city was such that it was a point for reckoning distances and elucidating geographic details. Before the building of the Roman roads, Sinope was an important port of Eastern trade; and its commerce with the northern shore of the Euxine Dr.

Robinson believes to have been underrated. Sinope's golden age was from 444 to the peace of Antalcidas, which left the Euxine Greeks at the mercy of Persia. In 370 there was a strong Greek element in the city but a Persian political preponderance. The loyalty of the city to Darius was not resented by Alexander the Great. The citizens were, as usual in frontier communities, rough and ready and fearless. The concluding section of the volume, forty pages, deals with inscriptions from Sinope.

Die römische Timokratie. Von Dr. Francis Smith. (Berlin, Georg Nauck, 1906, pp. 161.) This dissertation combats the traditional view that Servius, the next to the last of the Roman kings, established a timocratic division of Roman citizens in five classes. Against this tradition and in sharp contradiction to it, Dr. Smith sets the point that there existed at Rome as late as the second century B. C. a distinction between *classis* and *infra classem*; and the timocratic classification he places comparatively late in Roman history, in the time of Cato and the years following the second Punic War. The general character of the Servian reform Dr. Smith believes to have been military, not political; and in military affairs, classes played a rôle, if at all, only at the levy of the army, not in its organization. To the question when the class principle found entrance into the *comitatus maximus*, Dr. Smith replies that the word *classis* is undoubtedly of military origin, denoting, when used in distinction from *infra classem*, probably an élite body of troops; and the army having political functions, the term *classis* would acquire a political significance. This political significance is acquired before the relation of the term to the five timocratic grades fixed itself in the public mind. Indeed it was necessary for the old distinction of *classis* and *infra classem* to fall into desuetude before a timocratic classification was possible at all; and the Servian *Commentaries* are believed by Dr. Smith to be a late forgery designed to popularize the timocratic classification by casting over it a false halo of antiquity.

The Clarendon Press has issued, in its Tudor and Stuart Library, the *Defence of the Realme* by Sir Henry Knyvett, 1596, with an introduction by Charles Hughes (London and New York, Henry Frowde, 1906, pp. xxxvi, 75). Sir Henry Knyvett, of Charlton near Malmesbury in Wiltshire, sprang from a noble family of Norfolk. He was in favor with Queen Elizabeth, to whom this treatise is addressed. In the early days of her reign Knyvett was wounded at the siege of Leith, and at the time of the Spanish Armada he was active, as a deputy lieutenant for Wiltshire, in the military preparations in the south of England. Knyvett was prompted to write this tract by the capture of Calais from the French by the Spaniards on April 17, 1596, and the consequent fear in England of a Spanish invasion. The tract was written in haste, in fact Knyvett completed it by the end of

April. With respect to the danger of invasion, England's situation then was essentially the same as now; and Knyvett's plan of defense was also a favorite of to-day—a general military training of the citizens. On the technical side Knyvett's treatise is at its weakest. It advocates the use of the antiquated longbow. Knyvett died in 1598, two years after writing this tract, which is printed now for the first time. The manuscript is in the Chetham Library, Manchester.

Another issue of the same series by the Clarendon Press is a reprint of Pepys's *Memoires of the Royal Navy, 1679-1688* (London and New York, Henry Frowde, 1906, pp. xviii, 143). A serviceable introduction is prefixed by the editor, J. R. Tanner, Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Pepys, who wrote his *Diary* between his twenty-sixth and thirty-sixth years, lived to the age of seventy and was long a valued official in the Admiralty. In 1679 he was driven from office by the Popish Plot. He was recalled by the king in 1684. In the interval the office of Lord High Admiral was in commission, with ill results to the navy; and Pepys, as Secretary of the Admiralty, was intimately connected with, and even guided, the subsequent naval reform. These *Memoires* were published originally by Pepys in June, 1690. They are a defense of his own naval administration prior to 1688, and a criticism of that of his opponents. The treatise contains many details concerning the navy at this period. By Pepys it was intended as a forerunner of his projected *Navalia*, a general history of the British navy which he never published nor completed.

Journals of the Honorable William Hervey. In North America and Europe from 1755 to 1814. With Order Books at Montreal 1760-1763. With Memoir and Notes. *Suffolk Green Books*, No. XIV. (Paul and Mathew, Bury St. Edmunds, 1906, pp. lxxvi, 548.) Eleven volumes of the *Suffolk Green Books* have now been published, and volumes XI., XII., and XIII. are still in preparation. The volume containing the *Journals of William Hervey* is numbered XIV.; although there seems to be no special reason why the three still unpublished should precede it in the series. There is neither continuity of time nor similarity of subject in the fourteen volumes. All of them are records of Suffolk, or of Suffolk families, and three contain diaries of members of the Hervey family. Nine are made up of registers, annals, and tombstones of Suffolk townships, and of subsidy and tax returns, while number XIII., which has yet to appear, contains the records of the Bury Grammar School from Edward VI. to Edward VII. The whole series therefore contains merely raw material of history, and this is especially true of the *Journals of William Hervey*. These journals were contained in fifty-eight note-books, dating from 1755 to 1814, which are in the possession of Lord Bristol as head of the Hervey family. Two years (1764 and 1765) of these sixty years are not represented in the diaries; and the first two volumes are of doubt-

ful authorship—the editor is convinced that they were not written by William Hervey, but came into his possession in 1757 during the first year of his campaigning in the French War in America. The other fifty-six diaries are undoubtedly the work of William Hervey, and the editor has culled from them the long series of extracts which fill almost 500 pages of his book. The value of the American diaries and order-books—from 1760 to 1763 order-books take the place of diaries—lies in the evidently truthful and sincere account of an officer who took part in the campaigns of the Seven Years' War, and who sets down impartially particulars as to regiments participating in the campaigns, the character of the country traversed, the conduct of French and Indians during the fighting, and the discipline meted out to deserters and disobedient soldiers. No new light is thrown on the general conduct of the campaigns against the French, either in the United States or in Canada; but the historian can learn from the diaries much of the daily difficulties of the marches; of the methods adopted to guard against surprises, and to convey ammunition and stores. After 1766, the diaries cover only peaceful journeyings on the continent of Europe and in the British Isles. William Hervey's observations throw some light on social and industrial conditions from 1766 to 1814, but it will take much winnowing to find the grain among the chaff. The editor has supplied an excellent subject-index—an index that is a model of its kind; and the portraits, illustrations, and maps add considerably to the value of the work.

A. G. P.

Gouverneur Morris. Un Témoin Américain de la Révolution Française. Par A. Esmein, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1906, pp. 386.) The *point de départ* of this book was evidently a remark of Taine to the effect that four contemporary observers comprehended from the beginning the character and significance of the French Revolution, Rivarol, Malouet, Gouverneur Morris, and Mallet du Pan, and that the greatest of these was Mallet. To Mr. Esmein, on the other hand, it seems that most of the merits ascribed by Taine to Mallet may be claimed for Morris: long residence in France, important connections, abundant information, good judgment, and thorough familiarity with the game of politics. Therefore he has undertaken to compose a history of the French Revolution largely from the writings of this vivid American. He had pieced together the most important descriptions, characterizations, and judgments of Morris into a continuous narrative. His chief source has been the *Diary and Letters* edited by Anne Cary Morris. Some slight use is made of a few other memoirs, such as those of the remaining three of the Taine tetrad, Mallet, Malouet, and Rivarol. But in the main he rarely strays from the two thick volumes of Morris's emphatic impressions.

It may be said at once that Mr. Esmein has put his material together with skill, that its mosaic quality is excellent. But naturally a narrative

so constructed cannot be very full-bodied. The history of the French Revolution can never be written from the *Diary and Letters* of Gouverneur Morris, nor from the diary and letters of any other man. Morris's main interest lies in following the plots and intrigues, the vicissitudes of party warfare. Here his analysis is keen, his information considerable, his statement clear. This is what our author wisely sets forth. Mr. Esmein recognizes in Morris's writings, as in Taine's, where it is far less excusable, that there is no light thrown upon a whole side of the Revolution, and that, too, its most beneficent and permanent side, the varied, searching, wide-ranging reforms in the domain of civil and criminal and commercial law, which later passed largely into the codes, and which still inspire French jurisprudence. Moreover, as Mr. Esmein says, even in regard to constitutional legislation Morris had ideas which, though interesting, hardly harmonize with the French Revolution or even with the American Revolution.

Manifestly this book is not a work of research but rather of popularization. It can be of little value to English readers, who would prefer the original *Diary and Letters*. Whether it is useful to introduce Morris to French readers in this form rather than in a complete translation is a question that no American need attempt to answer.

At the basis of this book lies, of course, the assumption that Morris was an important contemporary witness of the Revolution. Taine to the contrary, the correctness of this assumption may be doubted. Morris was essentially a stern and unbending Tory, more royalist than the king, partizan, trenchant, self-confident, polypragmatic; a man who knew his France superficially and who knew little of the real causes of the Revolution; whose circle was narrow though animated; whose characterizations of prominent men, though always entertaining, were frequently sadly wanting in verisimilitude; whose prophecies were more numerous than inspired. Though his comments have value, they are far from justifying the extravagant estimate of the author of *The Origins of Modern France*.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

Napoleon's Last Voyages. Being the Diaries of Admiral Sir Thomas Ussher, R.N., K.C.B. (On Board the *Undaunted*), and John R. Glover, Secretary to Rear-admiral Cockburn (on Board the *Northumberland*). With twenty Illustrations. With Introduction and Notes by J. Holland Rose, Litt.D. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906, pp. xxii, 247.) Of the two diaries forming this book, the first, that of Sir Thomas Ussher, was printed in London in 1840 and in Dublin in 1841. Mr. Unwin reprinted it in 1895. The second recital is fresher information. The author was secretary to Rear-admiral Sir George Cockburn, and the narrative has striking similarities to his diary, first published in Boston in 1883 and reprinted at London in 1888. The reason of its late appearance in the field of Napoleonic history is due to the fact that Mr. Glover, as was natural in the circumstances in which he was

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XI.—45

at the time when he wrote it, expressly forbade its publication. But the lapse of time has undone this injunction, and in 1893 the Glover diary first saw the light in magazine form and two years later appeared between covers under the title *Napoleon's Last Voyages*. Practically, therefore, the only thing wholly new about the work before us is the introduction and the notes prepared by the editor. The introduction is a luminous sketch of the personality of Napoleon at St. Helena, in the course of which Mr. Rose emphatically reiterates his conviction that Napoleon actually intended to invade England in 1805. The notes are not abundant but are pithy and to the point. By what seems an excess of conscientious editorship Mr. Rose has translated back into what he surmises to have been Napoleon's actual words the language attributed to him by the diarists. It should be added that there are twenty illustrations, being reproductions of contemporary prints, eight of which at least are rare.

J. W. T.

By request of the French section of the Royal Society of Canada, Dr. N. E. Dionne, Librarian of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, has undertaken the preparation of a bibliography of publications relating to Quebec and New France. The completed work will be in four volumes, of which the first and second appeared in 1905 and 1906 (Quebec, printed for the author, pp. viii, 175; viii, 155, vi). The third and fourth may be expected in 1907 and 1908. These four volumes are an *Inventaire Chronologique*: the first, of those works in the French language which were published in the province of Quebec from the establishment of the first Canadian printing-press in 1764 to 1905; the second, of those works on Quebec and New France which were published without the province from 1534 to 1906; the third, of works published within the province in other than the French language from 1764 to 1906; and the fourth, of all atlases, charts, and maps bearing on New France and Quebec published in Canada and elsewhere from the discovery of the country to 1907. Of the two volumes now issued the first lists upward of three thousand works and contains a register of the periodical press of Quebec past and present, in number eight hundred, with dates of foundation and, if the journal be defunct, of its discontinuance. The second volume lists two thousand works, with frequent explanatory notes by the editor. Neither of the volumes professes to be exhaustive. In the first there are omitted, in particular, school-books, most devotional works, almanacs, regulations of religious, national, and benevolent associations, electoral pamphlets, and some official literature of minor importance.

Early English and French Voyages, chiefly from Hakluyt, 1534-1608. Edited by Henry S. Burrage, D.D. [*Original Narratives of Early American History*, edited by J. F. Jameson, Volume III.] (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906, pp. xxii, 451.) This work contains

the narratives of the voyages of Cartier, More, Hawkins, Drake, Gilbert, Barlowe, Lane, White, Brereton, Pring, Weymouth, and an anonymous narrative entitled "A Relation of a voyage to Sagadahoc, 1607-1608." While the majority of these narratives have been known to students in old Hakluyt and the reproductions in various society publications, the general reader, although well acquainted with the deeds of the above-named adventurers, has only read, as a rule, extracts or abridgments. The ponderous volumes compiled by Hakluyt, Purchas, and others in olden times, combined with old spelling and quaint letters, have been obstacles which have frequently discouraged the general reader. This publication edited by Dr. Burrage is one which meets a long-felt want. The reader has sufficient information about the narrators, both historical and bibliographical, to whet his appetite and increase his interest. The index is copious and the general get-up of the volume is pleasing. The events recorded are indispensable to one wishing to form a correct idea of the early expansion of the New World. Ralph Lane's account of the first expedition sent out by Walter Raleigh to Virginia, in 1585-1586, is just now of timely interest. This expedition landed the first colony in Virginia, under the charge of Lane. One hundred and seven remained with Lane, from August 17, 1585, to June 18, 1586. As the first description of the people and the country it is not only of great importance but also of much historical consequence.

The only map published in this work is the one entitled "Map of Virginia, i. e., the Region of the Raleigh Colonies, made by John White in 1585 or 1586." This map was not originally published in the early edition of Hakluyt, but is reproduced from a manuscript map in the British Museum for the new twelve-volume edition recently published. The map was first known to this country in an article by Dr. Edward Eggleston, in the *Century* for November, 1882, pages 61-83, entitled "The Beginning of a Nation", accompanied by the "Map of southern part of Atlantic coast of North America."

The map, however, which should have accompanied this work is the one spoken of rather indefinitely in note 2 to page 248, as the De Bry map. As this so-called De Bry map, also by John White or Withl, who accompanied the first Raleigh expedition, is considered the first map and bears the name of Virginia, there is every reason to suppose that it should have been published instead of the other. The only known copy of this map is found in the work published by De Bry entitled *The True Pictures and Fashions of the People in that Part of America now called Virginia*, published in four versions in 1590. This map will be of especial interest in the coming Jamestown exhibit as the first map of Virginia.

P. LEE PHILLIPS.

The Connecticut River and the Valley of the Connecticut. By Edwin M. Bacon. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906, pp. xx, 487.) This is an account, intended for the general reader, of the history, navi-

gation, and topography of the Connecticut River. Its historical section comprises three hundred pages. It begins with the arrival of the Dutch at the mouth of the river in 1614, and ends with the collapse of the Eastern and Western Unions in 1782. More attention than usual is paid to the discovery and early settlement of the lower valley by the Dutch. Made plain also are the parts played by the Pilgrims and Puritans in the English occupation of the region. With the river as a thread there then follow the events which made up an important part of the history of New England during a century—the Pequot War, King Philip's War, the French and Indian Wars, the New Hampshire grants, and the attempt at founding a separate state, New Connecticut, in the upper valley. The familiar story is well told and gives the lie afresh to the complaint that picturesque America is lacking in historical associations.

With a wealth of local histories to draw from, Judd, Sheldon, Thompson, Chase, Wells, and others, a very fair proportion has been observed until the subject of Dartmouth College is reached. There undue emphasis is placed upon local politics, while hardly any reference is made to the part which the inhabitants of the upper valley took in the Revolution. The constant fear under which they lived of invasion from Canada is not mentioned; the Westminster Massacre barely appears; and the panic caused by the threatened coming of Burgoyne has no place. By contrast, two chapters are devoted to the political ambitions of the professors of Dartmouth College, in the intricate question of allegiance to New Hampshire or Vermont, which long agitated the river towns of the upper valley.

The second part of the book treats of the navigation of the river from the days of canoes to the end of the steamboat period. We wish that a chapter had been added describing, as clearly as the several paths from Massachusetts to Connecticut are described in chapter III., the ferries and the devious ways by which the settlers' ox-carts travelled along the banks of the river. In part III. the author begins with Pittsburg and West Stewartstown in the extreme north, and makes his bow and pays his compliments, somewhat after the fashion of the county gazetteers, to each town and city on either bank until Saybrook and the Sound are reached. Yet it is one of the assets of the river that so many institutions of learning are situated on its banks, and that so many artists and men of letters should have made their homes beside it.

A few minor slips occur; *e. g.*, Sophia, not Maria, Smith founded Smith College. The book is well printed, and profusely and beautifully illustrated. It has an index, and in its table of contents a synopsis is given of each chapter.

KATE M. CONE.

Groseilliers and Radisson, the First White Men in Minnesota, 1655-56, and 1659-60, and their Discovery of the Upper Mississippi River. By Warren Upham, Secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society. (St.

Paul, Reprint from volume X. of the Society's *Publications*, 1905, pp. iv, 146.) When, in 1885, the Prince Society of Boston published the manuscripts of Peter Esprit Radisson—manuscripts that had been preserved by Samuel Pepys and afterward rescued from the wrapping-paper stocks of London tradesmen, finally to enrich the collections of Oxford University and the British Museum—that worthy organization could not have foreseen the apple of discord it was about to toss among the historians of the Old Northwest. Did Radisson and his companion Groseilliers actually discover the upper Mississippi seventeen years before Marquette and Joliet explored the great river? Were the two trader brothers-in-law from Three Rivers the first white men to sail the waters of Lake Superior? Did they also make an overland journey from the Great Lakes to Hudson Bay, thereby getting their first actual knowledge of the region where later they established the great trading company which persists to this day? These are a few of the many queries, on various sides of which scores of investigators have ranged themselves. Without professing to have said the last word on the subject, Mr. Warren Upham, secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society, has gathered a large amount of evidence to prove that Radisson and Groseilliers did actually come upon the Mississippi at Prairie Island, Minnesota, and that they were the first white men in the present state of Minnesota. Adopting the chronology carefully worked out by Henry Colin Campbell with the aid of the *Jesuit Relations* and the *Journal of the Jesuits*, Mr. Upham reaches the conclusion that the Frenchmen spent the time from April or May, 1655, to June, 1656, at Prairie Island, in the Mississippi, a few miles above Red Wing, without, however, being conscious that they had reached the great river. In his wanderings Radisson came upon the Illinois River, and from the Indians thereabouts he gained his knowledge of the Mississippi. The second journey to the West took place between 1658 and 1660. In neither journey did the Frenchmen reach either the Gulf of Mexico or Hudson Bay, as some writers have been led to believe. Because they themselves failed to discern the geographical importance of the great river they had come upon; and because, so far as possible, they concealed from their countrymen all knowledge of their travels, Radisson and Groseilliers are not entitled, according to Mr. Upham, to be ranked as the discoverers of the Upper Mississippi. It was Marquette and Joliet who literally *discovered* that river by making known to the world that they had found the great waters of which many had heard, and for which they were searching. This judgment has both common sense and historical research to commend it. At the same time it reduces Radisson and Groseilliers to their proper proportions; they were mere traders, who blundered upon the Mississippi without discovering it. Even the fact that they looked upon its waters has remained unknown for more than two centuries. There is a wealth of bibliographical and chronological information in Mr. Upham's paper, which adds to its value to students.

CHARLES MOORE.

King Philip's War, . . . with Biographical and Topographical Notes. By George W. Ellis and John E. Morris. (New York, The Grafton Press, 1906, pp. xiv, 326.) A history of King Philip's War which should be both readable and trustworthy has long been desired by students of early New England. The volume under review meets these requirements, being based upon careful research and written in clear narrative style. Of the two authors whose names appear on the title-page, Mr. Ellis has contributed the narrative with the references, and Mr. Morris has supplied the biographical foot-notes, the local descriptions, and the illustrations.

Mr. Ellis has used his sources with discrimination and impartiality. His attitude toward those clerical annalists who ascribed a failure in arms to supernatural causes, and who laboriously sought the Scriptures to find some text to excuse a merciless or criminal act, is refreshing and convincing. He rightly blames the English for their neglect in the earlier part of the war to take even the simplest precautions against surprise and ambushes, for the long-continued refusal on the part of the authorities to enlist the services of the "friendly" Indians, and for their participation in needless acts of cruelty and torture. The death of Canonchet, says the author (p. 205), "was as honorable to him as its infliction and the shameful mutilation of his body was disgraceful to his enemies. Something of his lofty and dignified character seems to have impressed itself upon the grudging minds of his foes, but it called up no corresponding chivalry of action." Yet in no way should it be understood that the author is a sentimental apologist for the Indian. His unwillingness to place dependence upon any but credited sources and his summary rejection of many of the romantic legends connected with the war evidence his attempt to treat his subject with true historical discrimination.

The volume is singularly free from errors or misquotations from authorities. It was not Williams (p. 26) who purchased the island of Rhode Island, and the author of the recent excellent little history of Rhode Island is not "Reichman" (p. 35). There is no adequate reason for placing the scene of Talcott's victory of July 2, 1676, at Natick, when contemporary evidence shows that it was at Nipsachuck. In its mechanical make-up the book reflects much credit upon the Grafton Press, who publish it as a part of the series edited by Dr. Henry R. Stiles.

CLARENCE S. BRIGHAM.

Cadwallader Colden: a Representative Eighteenth Century Official. By Alice Mapelsden Keys, Ph.D. (New York, Columbia University Press, The Macmillan Company, 1906, pp. xiv, 375.) Miss Keys's monograph is based primarily on the Colden Papers, two volumes of which have been printed by the New York Historical Society. She has also used the manuscript minutes of the Executive Council and the principal printed sources for the period covered. It does not appear,

however, that Miss Keys has gone very far afield for illustrative material such as might have been furnished by the Johnson Manuscripts, the newspapers, or the broadside collections. Colden has been presented to us in four characters, or rather as one character playing four parts—savant, surveyor, politician, executive. Aside from the fact that it is difficult to separate the surveyor from the politician, this arrangement does little violence to chronology, and is on the whole probably the best possible one. The style is a bit loose, the manner a bit casual; one is perhaps somewhat at sea in the mass of facts, unrelieved for the most part by any very suggestive generalization. Whatever the “general reader” may think, the specialist will nevertheless be grateful for much new light on the web of intrigue which enmeshed the colonial governors from Burnet to Clinton. And meantime three points of more general interest emerge from the detailed narrative: the extent to which personal and family rivalries dominated New York provincial politics; the incredible neglect of the English government to support its officials in their efforts to check the encroachments of the assembly on executive functions; the uselessness of the well-meaning doctrinaire in practical administration. Miss Keys has appreciated Colden perfectly: “With all his interests, all his learning, all his real worth, he had learned no lesson from experience” (p. 258). The least valuable part of the work is that which deals with the period after 1765. The author has apparently missed the striking significance of Colden’s brief day of popularity after the death of Moore. The meaning of the elections of 1768 and 1769 is not correctly appreciated. Statements with respect to the election of the Committee of Fifty-One and the election of the delegates to the First Continental Congress are misleading (p. 355). An unfortunate blunder of the publishers has resulted in a systematic misplacement of the pages from 352 to 369. The citation of authorities is not so full as could be wished, and there is no critical bibliography.

CARL BECKER.

The Writings of James Madison. Edited by Gaillard Hunt. Vol. VI., 1790–1802. (New York, G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1906, pp. xvii, 464.) There is little that is new in this sixth volume. About half of it consists of Madison’s speeches in the First Congress, for which the text in the *Annals* seems to be taken as sufficiently ample and authoritative, his various contributions to Freneau’s *National Gazette*, “*Helvidius*”, his speech on the Jay treaty, and his Virginia report of 1799–1800. The rest is correspondence, embracing a dozen or so of family letters not printed in the former or Congressional edition, but of small importance, dealing largely with the errands which a son or brother visiting Philadelphia would inevitably do for a country family or neighborhood in Virginia. There are also a few other new letters, and from Madison’s assumption of the secretaryship of state in May, 1801, an important series of instructions to the American representatives in England, France

and Spain. The foot-notes, though not numerous, are almost uniformly good. That on p. 411 seems open to criticism. Madison says, speaking of Adams in a letter to Jefferson, January 10, 1801, "The follies of his administration, the oblique stroke at his Predecessor in the letter to Coxe, and the crooked character of that to T. Pinkney, are working powerfully against him." Under the name of "T. Pinkney" Mr. Hunt says, in a foot-note, "Pickering is meant". It seems much more natural to suppose no error, but to infer that the reference is to Adams's conciliatory letter of October 27, 1800, to Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina, called out by the publication of his unfortunate letter of May, 1792, to Tench Coxe, and by Pinckney's request for an explanation.

It is not easy to reconcile one's self to the mode of arrangement which the editor has followed in the case of letters contemporary with the public papers printed. The principle has been to give the latter the first place, at the top of the pages, and to "run in" the letters below, in smaller type, though elsewhere letters have a larger type than documents. Letters, documents, foot-notes, and even foot-notes to foot-notes, run across from page to page in such a manner that we sometimes have on the same page four strata of typography. Thus on pp. 43-123, beneath the newspaper contributions, we have twenty-seven letters, forty-seven foot-notes to the text and foot-notes to foot-notes, and a group of documents, the most interesting of all, relative to Washington's proposed farewell address of 1792. The effect is both ugly and confusing.

Pubblica Dimostrazione di Simpatia per il Papa Pio IX. e per l'Italia avvenuta a New York, Lunedì 29 Novembre 1847, tratta dai Rendiconti inglesi di quell'anno, con Prefazione, Note, ed Appendici, di H. Nelson Gay. (Roma, Roux e Viarengo; Boston, N. J. Bartlett and Company, 1907, pp. 94.) With this volume Mr. H. Nelson Gay begins what promises to be a useful series of publications on the more important phases of the *Relations between the United States and Italy, 1847-1871*. The book relates to a great mass-meeting held in New York in favor of Italian independence, the first gathering of this character convened outside Italy. The greater part of the volume is an Italian translation of the rare report of the *Proceedings*, prepared under the supervision of the committee of arrangements. The report, which includes letters and addresses from several of the most prominent citizens of the United States, welcoming as an extension of popular constitutional government the reforms instituted by the new Pope, constitutes one of the earliest and truest declarations of faith in a free and united Italy. No historian of either country mentions the meeting, yet it is important as a declaration of American public opinion and as marking the beginning of a quarter of a century of good relations between the United States and the constitutional states of Italy.

The volume contains a brief preface and appendixes including sketches based in part upon unpublished documents of the lives of the

two distinguished Italian exiles, Giuseppe Avezzana and Eleutario Felice Foresti, both highly honored in America.

Causa Mandada Formar á D. Leonardo Márquez por Desobediencia é Insubordinación como General en Jefe del Primer Cuerpo del Ejército de Operaciones. [Documentos Inéditos ó muy Raros para la Historia de México, publicados por Genaro García y Carlos Pereyra, Tomo VIII.] (Mexico, 1906, pp. viii, 288.) The alleged acts of disobedience and insubordination of General Márquez to which relates the series of documents published under this title—some of them given in full, and some merely calendared—were committed during the year 1859 in the course of the War of Reform in Mexico. The charges were based upon Márquez's failure, in several instances, to direct his movements or handle his troops as ordered by the Miramón government, and on the tone of his letters to the minister of war, which were characterized as breathing insubordination and even inciting rebellion.

The manuscript followed in printing this series of documents (except for the list in the appendix) is said to have belonged originally to J. F. Ramírez, then to J. M. Andrade, and finally to the nephew of the latter, V. de P. Andrade, from whom Señor García obtained it. To the documents contained in the manuscript Señor García has appended many others relating to Márquez and his operations in the latter part of 1859, several of them being taken from the *Diario Oficial del Supremo Gobierno de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos*. Some that would naturally belong to the record of the case are not given at all, e. g., the "excepción declinatoria" of Márquez denying the jurisdiction of the council of war to which the military code assigned such cases. The argument of this "excepción" can be judged only by the summary of it given in the opinion of the assessor (p. 61).

The printing of this volume bears evidence of a certain degree of carelessness. Among the errors which must be charged to proof-reader and printer are "ofeció" for *ofreció* (p. 76, l. 3), "ui" for *ni* (p. 90, l. 18), "ey" for *ley* (p. 256, l. 14), and "conideradas" apparently for *considerada* (p. 244, ll. 3, 4). The italicized passage on page 118 ought to be precisely the same as the corresponding passage on page 48, since both are from the same original; but the change in position of a semicolon, transferring the word "después" from one clause to another, has made an essential variation in the meaning. This may be the fault of the manuscript used by the editor; but the few annotations he has made refer to just such points, and a foot-note dealing with this, if it be in fact due to the manuscript, might fairly have been expected.

While this series of "Documentos Inéditos ó muy Raros" hardly affords the same abundant proof of Señor García's ability and erudition as some other works of his, notably his *Carácter de la Conquista Española*, he is doing historical science in America a real service in the publication of the series, and his enterprise certainly deserves sympathy and support.

GEORGE P. GARRISON.

Gettysburg and Lincoln: The Battle, the Cemetery, and the National Park. By Henry Sweetser Burrage, Brevet Major, U. S. Vols. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906, pp. xii, 224.) The title of this book gives a summary of its contents. Part I. contains a brief and well-written account of the battle of Gettysburg. Part II. is devoted to the movement for a national cemetery at Gettysburg, and to the consecration services of that cemetery. The most original and interesting parts of the book are the chapters in part II. which give a detailed discussion of Lincoln's address at Gettysburg. Major Burrage has collected all of the available information regarding the composition of this now famous address, and presents his account in an interesting manner. Part III. contains a history of the work of the Gettysburg Battle-field Memorial Association, and of the National Park Commission. The book is clearly written, and should be of much interest to those who have taken part in the preservation of our most famous battle-field.

Documentary History of Reconstruction. By Walter L. Fleming, Ph.D., Professor of History in West Virginia University. Volume I. (Cleveland, The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1906, pp. xix, 492.) The purpose of this volume, as the author tells us in his preface, is to make some of the sources relating to the political, military, social, religious, educational, and industrial history of the Reconstruction period more easily accessible to the student and the general reader. It is to the former class, however, that the book will be more valuable, for it is scarcely the kind of matter that will hold the attention of the general reader on account of its necessarily fragmentary nature. From such a collection, large as it is, it would be manifestly impossible for one to gain a definite idea of Reconstruction conditions, but from it may be gained quite a definite idea of Reconstruction sentiment. So far it will be valuable to the general reader. To the close student of the period it will, naturally, prove of far more interest and value. The selections are well made and are to a high degree illustrative of public sentiment at the time. It is in these respects and as a guide to the period of Reconstruction that the book is most valuable.

In this first volume the documents show a decided leaning to Radical sentiment and opinion. In his preface, Dr. Fleming states that the contrary will be the case in the second volume. In all there are 252 separate documents, of which the origin is as follows: 148 are accounts from Northern men; 62 are from ex-Confederates; 22 from Southern Unionists and Radicals; 12 from negroes; and 2 from foreigners. There are also 25 state laws and 17 Federal laws. Of the non-legal documents, 118 are from the Northern standpoint; 64 are from the Southern; and about 70 are indifferent or impartial.

The first chapter, entitled "The South after the War: Economic and Social Conditions", contains, among other things, much interesting matter relating to the period immediately succeeding the suspension

of hostilities, such as the treatment of the negroes, the destruction of property, the privations and suffering of both blacks and whites, and opinions as to what was necessary to restore the South to a condition of loyalty and prosperity. The second chapter, "Plans, Theories, and Problems of Reconstruction", gives clear contrasts of the views held on the subject by Lincoln, Johnson, and Congress, with other documents illustrating the views of Sumner, Stevens, prominent Southerners of different parties, and of Abolitionists. Chapter III. deals with Presidential restoration. The next two chapters are devoted exclusively to the freedman, chapter iv. illustrating the discussion of the race and labor problems and the attempts to settle them by the so-called "Black Codes", and chapter v. being composed of matter—and very interesting and valuable matter too—relating to the Freedmen's Bureau and the Freedmen's Bank. The sixth and last chapter deals with Congressional Reconstruction. Each chapter has an introduction by the author with references to the various documents. There is also a bibliography to each chapter. The work has the limitations which are inseparable from all source-books of limited size, but it also has what many source-books have not, namely, interest. It can scarcely be called with accuracy a history, even though a documentary one, of Reconstruction, but it is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject.

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON.

A Frontier Town and Other Essays. By Henry Cabot Lodge. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906, pp. 274.) Senator Lodge has collected into this volume a number of essays and addresses, most of which have appeared in print before. The essays may be roughly grouped as biographical, political, and historical. Of the biographical essays the one of most interest is that which is devoted to the late Senator Hoar. Although delivered as a memorial address before the Massachusetts legislature, it is not a simple eulogy of its subject, but a careful summary and characterization of the public services of the late Senator from Massachusetts. Of the political essays that upon "The Senate of the United States" is the most important. Senator Lodge is naturally not one who believes that the Senate has gained more than its rightful share in the government of our country, although, as he says, "the Senate is to-day the most powerful single chamber in any legislative body in the world" (p. 83); he contends that its great power is a direct result of the wise provisions inserted into the Constitution by its framers in 1787.

The essay upon "History" is the most interesting and stimulating of the historical essays. Senator Lodge expresses a somewhat prevalent feeling that scientific history has lost its literary character, and has become uninteresting and dull. History as a science has been developed at a serious loss to history as literature, and while the author recognizes the very great service of scientific standards in historical studies, he disapproves of the too judicial attitude and strongly dissents

from Professor Bury's statement that "history is not a branch of literature." Like many others, Senator Lodge would find the true purpose of history to be that of discovering a theory of human development, of laying down principles which shall explain past events and forecast the future. While advocating a philosophy of history, he admits that no one theory will explain everything, and points to the failure of such philosophies as have been developed in the past. The scientific historian of the present will hardly agree with the conclusion expressed in the following sentences: "A new period, bringing with it forces and conditions hitherto unknown, confronts modern history. Unless she can solve the problem it presents, unless she can bring forth a theory of the universe and of life which shall take up the past and from it read the riddle of the present and draw aside the veil of the future, then history in its highest sense has failed" (p. 127).

All of the essays are written in Senator Lodge's agreeable manner; he, at least, has preserved a literary finish in these essays upon historical and allied subjects. It is often refreshing to find such a book, which does not pretend to add to the store of human knowledge, but presents old views and known facts in a pleasing and attractive form.

TEXT-BOOKS

Outlines of Nineteenth Century History, by Philip Van Ness Myers (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1906, pp. v, 138), is a reprint of the chapters of the same author's *Mediaeval and Modern History*, which cover the nineteenth century after 1815. The opportunity has been taken to revise the text with respect to the Russo-Japanese war. In a note on page 4 reference is made to the recent separation of Norway and Sweden, but with an unfortunate typographical error which places the dissolution of the union as occurring in 1805. In this separate form the book will be useful as a brief introductory work upon the history of the nineteenth century. It would have been better, however, to include the chapters upon the Napoleonic era; the elementary student would be somewhat embarrassed if introduced without preparation to the complex problems presented at the Congress of Vienna.

NOTES AND NEWS

GENERAL

Frederick William Maitland, Downing Professor of the Laws of England at Cambridge University, died at the Grand Canary on December 21, aged fifty-six. The impetus that he gave to the studies of institutional and legal history in England is incalculably great, as is the loss that historical studies have suffered through his death. He was educated at Eton and Trinity, and practised as a barrister for several years, returning to Cambridge only in 1884 as Reader in English law. In this same year he published his book *Gloucester Pleas*, and in 1887 his celebrated edition of *Bracton's Note Book*. His productivity during the following years was remarkable; of most importance were the numerous volumes of texts, furnished with long and illuminating introductions, that he edited for the Selden Society; the *History of English Law* (1895), produced in co-operation with Sir Frederick Pollock, but in greater part his own; and *Domesday Book and Beyond* (1897), in which his extraordinary insight enabled him to interpret a record hitherto obscure. He had a genius for investigation, for criticism, and for interpretation, and his vivacity and unfailing sense of humor produced a lightness of touch that makes his legal learning eminently readable. His last work, *The Life and Letters of Leslie Stephen* (1906), although outside the historical field, may be mentioned here as throwing light on the character of the biographer. Those American students who are fortunate enough to have known him will not soon forget his rare kindness and his power of enkindling other minds.

Henry Francis Pelham, President of Trinity College, Oxford, Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University, and Fellow of the British Academy, died on February 12, aged sixty. His writings include *Outlines of Roman History* (1890) and several articles in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, and elsewhere, which show his mastery of the results of research in the field of Roman History. An able administrator, he did much to organize the study of history and archaeology at Oxford, aided the Hellenic Society and the British School at Athens, and was the chief founder of the British School at Rome.

Ernest Désiré Glasson, one of the principal historians of French law, member of the Institute, and Professor in the Faculty of Law at Paris, died on January 6, at the age of sixty-seven. Of his numerous works on legal and institutional history, the most important are the *Histoire du Droit et des Institutions Politiques, Civiles et Judiciaires*

de l'Angleterre comparés au Droit et aux Institutions de la France depuis leur Origine jusqu'à nos Jours, six volumes (1882-1883); the *Histoire du Droit et des Institutions de la France*, in eight volumes, which stops with the end of the Middle Ages and which M. Glasson had intended to bring down to modern times; and *Le Parlement de Paris, son Rôle depuis Charles VII. jusqu'à la Révolution*, two volumes (1901).

M. Paul Guiraud, member of the Institute, professor of ancient history at the Sorbonne, and follower and biographer of Fustel de Coulanges, died recently in his fifty-seventh year. Among his more notable works are *La Propriété Foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la Conquête Romaine* (1893), in which he treats of landownership in Greece in close connection with its political history, and his recent volume *Études Économiques sur l'Antiquité*.

The veteran Professor Godefroid Kurth has been appointed director of the Belgian Historical Institute in Rome.

It is rumored that the Reading Room of the British Museum will be closed for six months including the approaching summer.

Recent numbers in Professor G. von Below-Meinecke's *Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte* (Munich, Oldenbourg) are Professor Luschin von Ebengreuth's *Allgemeine Münzkunde und Geldgeschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit* and a volume containing Professor Oswald Redlich's *Allgemeine Einleitung zur Urkundenlehre* and Professor W. Erben's *Die Kaiser- und Königsurkunden des Mittelalters in Deutschland, Frankreich und Italien* (pp. x, 369).

It is announced that a French translation of the archive handbook *Handleiding voor het Ordenen en Beschrijven van Archieven*, compiled by S. Muller, J. A. Feith, and R. Fruin, is being prepared by T. Cuvelier and H. Stein, and will include an introduction by H. Pirenne. A German translation has already appeared.

A useful volume for workers in the Archives Nationales, especially for students of modern history, is M. Ch. Schmidt's *Guide pour les Recherches d'Histoire Contemporaine aux Archives Nationales*. (*Les Demandes de Recherches, la Salle de Travail, les Inventaires; les Sources de l'Histoire d'un Département, d'un Arrondissement, d'un Canton ou d'une Commune aux Archives Nationales*.) The book, which is reprinted with numerous additions from three articles that appeared in the *Révolution Française*, is published by the house of Champion, Paris.

Morals in Evolution: a Study in Comparative Ethics (Chapman and Hall, two volumes), by L. T. Hobhouse, late Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, aims at reaching a conception of the main trend of human development by an historical classification of the different forms of ethical ideas.

The Macmillan Company is publishing a series entitled *The Church Universal*, edited by Rev. W. H. Hutton. Each of the eight volumes

will contain an outline of the history of the church during a given period. The following volumes have been issued: *The Church of the Fathers*, by Mr. Leighton Pullan; *The Church of the Barbarians*, by the editor; and *The Reformation*, by Rev. J. P. Whitney.

The celebrated history of the Councils of the Church by C. J. von Hefele (*Konziliengeschichte*), continued in the second edition by Cardinal Hergenröther, has been translated into French by a Benedictine of Farnborough under the title *Histoire des Conciles* (Paris, Letouzey). The old French translation by M. Delarc, made from the first German edition and thus not including Hergenröther's volumes, has long been difficult to procure. The new translation, based on the second German edition, has been brought up to date through the inclusion of additional matter in notes, appendixes, and bibliography and will be continued so as to include the Council of the Vatican. The work will be issued in twenty-four volumes.

The Marquis de la Mazelière's three-volume work on *Le Japon: Histoire et Civilisation* (Paris, Plon) covers the ancient and feudal ages and the Tokugawa.

A brochure by Professor C. Seignobos on *L'Histoire dans l'Enseignement Secondaire* (Paris, Colin, 1906, pp. 55) will be of especial interest to teachers who are using any of the text-books written by Professor Seignobos for his *Cours d'Histoire*. The author explains his conception of the aim and method of history and why he has tried to create a new instrument adapted to the new needs. By examples taken from different parts of his *Cours*, he shows how his method is to be applied in special instances.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. L. Poole, *Mary Bateson* (English Historical Review, January); L. Erhardt, *Die Anfänge und Grundbedingungen der Geschichte* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCVIII. 2); O. Redlich, *Historisch-Geographische Probleme* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXVII. 4).

ANCIENT HISTORY

At a recent meeting of the Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft in Berlin, Professor Hugo Winckler reported on the remarkable remains at Boghaz-Köi in the heart of Asia Minor, which he is to investigate under the auspices of the Society, and which he has identified with the city of Kheta, the central seat of the Hittite kingdom. The finds made there amount to over two thousand items, and include many letter fragments, tablets, etc., containing among other things treaties with the kings of Egypt and with subordinate potentates.

The Carnegie Institution has published in a volume embracing 62 pages of text and 106 plates *Egyptological Researches: Results of a Journey in 1904*, by Dr. W. Max Müller. The main object of the volume is the study of the monuments recording the relations of ancient Egypt to foreign countries, especially to Asia and Europe.

The third volume of the *History of Egypt* (pp. 406), published by Scribner's, extends from the nineteenth to the thirtieth dynasties and is by W. M. Flinders Petrie. The book is solidly packed with facts, and includes translations of documents and many illustrations.

The Archeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions (S.P.C.K., pp. 220), by the Rev. A. H. Sayce, embodies the Rhind lectures on archaeology which Professor Sayce delivered at Edinburgh last October, and also an article published in the *Contemporary Review* in August, 1905.

The next volume in the series of publications of the President White School of History and Political Science at Cornell will be the enlarged doctoral thesis of Albert T. Olmstead, entitled *Sargon and Western Asia in His Time, 722-705 B. C.*, the materials for which were collected when the author accompanied Professor Nathaniel Schmidt's expedition through Syria and Palestine in 1904-1905.

Old Babylonian Temple Records, by Dr. R. J. Lau, forms the third volume in the Columbia University Oriental Studies (Macmillan).

Late Babylonian Letters (pp. xxxvi, 226), by R. C. Thompson, is a volume of transliterations and translations of letters in Babylonian cuneiform, chiefly during the reigns of Nabonidus, Cyrus, Cambyses, and Darius, published in Luzac's Semitic Text and Translation Series.

Professor T. D. Seymour's *Life in the Homeric Age* (Macmillan, 1906) attempts to state as the poet presents them the facts relating to the civilization of the age.

Life in Ancient Athens: the Social and Public Life of a Classical Athenian from Day to Day, by Professor T. G. Tucker, is a recent addition to the series of Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities published by Macmillan. The book contains many illustrations.

Schools of Hellas: a Study of the Practice and Theory of Greek Education in the Classical Period, by the late K. J. Freeman, has been edited by Mr. M. J. Rendall and will shortly be published by Messrs. Macmillan. The first part of the book deals with education in Sparta and Crete, Athens, and the rest of Greece. Separate chapters are devoted to primary, physical, and secondary education and one relates to the Ephebi and the University. The second part treats of the theory of education.

L'Aventin dans l'Antiquité (Paris, Fontemoing, 1906, pp. 476), by A. Merlin, which forms the ninety-seventh fascicle of the *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, is a careful and detailed study based upon documentary evidence and a study of the locality.

Decimus Iunius Brutus Albinus (University of Chicago Press, 1907, pp. 113) is the subject of a Chicago doctoral dissertation by B. C. Bonduant, whose interpretation of the motives and conduct of Decimus Brutus differs essentially from that given in M. Paulus's dissertation on the same subject (Münster, 1889).

The influence of Hellenism upon the Roman world has often been considered. The opposite influence of Rome upon Hellenic and Eastern civilization up to the time of Hadrian is the subject of Dr. L. Hahn's study, *Rom und Romanismus im Griechisch-Römischen Osten* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1906, pp. xvi, 278).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. J. Webb, *The Alleged Phœnician Circumnavigation of Africa* (English Historical Review, January); B. Niese, *Über Wehrverfassung, Dienstpflicht und Heerwesen Griechenlands* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCVIII. 2); E. Gabrici, *Il Problema delle Origini di Roma, secondo le Recenti Scoperte Archeologiche* (Rivista di Storia Antica, N.S., II. 1); G. Spagna, *Sulla Popolazione dell'Antica Siracusa* (ibid.); N. Feliciani, *L'Anno dei Quattro Imperatori: Galba, Ottone, Vitellio, Vespasiano* (ibid.).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

The Rev. J. P. Whitney has been appointed an editor of *The Cambridge Medieval History* in place of the late Miss Mary Bateson.

Sir Rennell Rodd has published through Arnold a two-volume study of Greece in the Middle Ages, entitled *The Princes of Achaia and the Chronicles of Morea*.

Der Sieg Heinrichs IV. in Kanossa (Braunschweig, Goeritz, 1907, pp. 76), by Dr. A. Dammann, is a critical investigation in which the author concludes that Henry IV. did not under humiliating conditions beg the pope to remove the ban, but that as king and at the head of his great army he demanded its removal.

Gustave Schlumberger, of the Institute of France, has published a work on *Campagnes du Roi Amaury I^{er} de Jérusalem in Egypt of the twelfth century*.

Father P. G. Golubovich, O.F.M., is compiling a *Biblioteca Bibliografica della Terra Santa e dell'Oriente Francese*, of which the first volume covers the period 1215-1300 (Quaracchi, Collège Saint-Bonaventure, 1906, pp. viii, 479).

A contribution to the commercial history of a limited portion of Europe in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is Léon Gauthier's *Les Lombards dans les Deux-Bourgognes* (Paris, Champion, 1907, pp. xiii, 397); the *pièces justificatives* number 172.

Of two recent works entitled *L'Inquisition*, one by Abbé Vacandard (Paris, Bloud, 1906) is an historical and critical study of the coercive power of the Church; the other, by Monsignor Douais (Paris, Plon, pp. 371), treats of the origins and procedure of the institution studied.

Documentary publications: Leto Alessandri, *Inventario dell'Antica Biblioteca del S. Convento di S. Francesco in Assisi, compilato nel 1381*, with notes (Assisi, Metastasio, 1906, pp. xlii, 270).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Fournier, *Étude sur les Fausses Décrétales*, V. *Les Fausses Décrétales. Le Saint-Siège*, concl. (Revue

d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January); H. Niese, *Normannische und Stau-
fische Urkunden aus Apulien* (Quellen und Forschungen, IX. 2); F.
Schneider, *Bistum und Geldwirtschaft: Zur Geschichte Volterras im
Mittelalter*, II. (Quellen und Forschungen, IX. 2); H. Otto, *Die Eide
und Privilegien Heinrichs VII. und Karls IV.* [with unprinted docu-
ments] (Quellen und Forschungen, IX. 2).

MODERN HISTORY

Professor W. H. Woodward, of the University of Liverpool, treats
of the development of the idea of a liberal education in his volume
of *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600*
(Cambridge University Press, Contributions to the History of Education,
II., pp. xx, 336).

Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami (London, Frowde) is
intended to be a complete edition—the first for two centuries—of the
correspondence of Erasmus, including the prefaces to his works. The
first of the five or six intended volumes covers the period from 1484 to
1515, and is edited by P. S. Allen of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

The first volume of a collection of treaties between Austria and
England, edited under the title *Österreichische Staatsverträge—England*
(pp. xiv, 813) by Professor A. F. Pribram of the University of Vienna,
extends from 1526 to 1748, and is the third in the series of *Veröffent-
lichungen der Kommission für neuere Geschichte Österreichs* (Inns-
bruck, Wagner).

Études sur la Politique Étrangère du Duc de Choiseul (Paris, Plon),
by A. Bourguet, is composed of four studies: one on the Austrian
alliance, another on the negotiations with Holland, and the last two on
the peace negotiations with England (1759 and 1761). The same author
has published a work on *Le Duc de Choiseul et l'Alliance Espagnole*.

The Vicomte Jean d'Ussel's account of *La Défection de la Prusse*
(*Décembre 1812-Mars 1813*) is based upon a study of the original
documents (Paris, Plon).

The *Memoirs of "Malakoff"* are extracts from the correspondence
and papers of the late W. E. Johnston, edited by his son, R. M. John-
ston. The book is largely made up of Mr. Johnston's letters written
from Paris to the *New York Times*, over the signature of "Malakoff",
and dealing with the Crimean War, the liberation of Italy, Napoleon
III., and our Civil War. The work is published by Hutchinson in
two volumes.

Der Krimkrieg und die Österreichische Politik is the subject of a
valuable monograph by Heinrich Friedjung, based on manuscript ma-
terial, published by Cotta (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1907, pp. 198).

Father T. Granderaeth's *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils von
seiner ersten Ankündigung bis zu seiner Vertagung* (Freiburg, Herder,
pp. xxi, 748) has been concluded by the publication of the third
volume.

La France et Guillaume II. (Paris, Colin, 1907, pp. 315), by Victor Bérard, aims at giving a complete idea of the relations between France and the German Emperor.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Müller, *Nürnberg's Botschaft nach Spanien zu Kaiser Karl V. im Jahre 1519* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCVIII. 2); L. Willaert, *Négociations politico-religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas Catholiques (1598-1625)*, 2. *Intervention des Archiducs en faveur du Catholicisme en Angleterre*, V. (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, January); de Fréville, *Lally et Bussy aux Indes, Avril, 1758-Mars, 1761* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); G. Servières, *Un Épisode de l'Expédition d'Irlande: L'Extradition et la Mise en Liberté de Napper Tandy (1798-1802)* (Revue Historique, January-February); J. E. Driault, *Napoléon et la Paix en 1813, à propos du dernier Volume d'Albert Sorci* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, December).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The second volume of Professor J. Hatschek's important work, *Englisches Staatsrecht* (Tübingen, Mohr, pp. 710), deals with the Constitution.

In *The Origin of the English Nation* (pp. 351), by H. Munro Chadwick, the author "has sought to make use of all branches of ethnological study—history, tradition, language, custom, religion, and antiquities." The book is published by the Cambridge University Press in the Cambridge Archeological and Ethnological Series.

An attempt to examine and arrange scientifically the legends of St. Edmund, king and martyr, is made in the volume entitled *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi* (London, Murray), which will include much from hitherto unpublished manuscripts, and a preface by Lord Francis Hervey.

His Grace the Steward and the Trial of Peers, by Mr. L. W. Vernon Harcourt, is a history of the origin and development of the Stewardship of England, announced for publication by Messrs. Longman. The work is based on original documents, many of which are unprinted.

The Domesday Inquest, by Adolphus Ballard, issued in the series of Antiquary's Books (Methuen), contains some new views on the question of the sokemen.

The Rev. S. Baring Gould and the Rev. John Fisher will publish, under the auspices of the Cymmrodorion Society, a work in four volumes on the *Lives of the British Saints*, containing unpublished pedigrees, original texts, and illustrations.

In C. G. Chamberlayne's dissertation on *Die Heirat Richards II. von England mit Anna von Luxemburg* (Halle, Kaemmerer, 1906, pp. 82), the author treats of the marriage and of its results, especially with reference to England's relations with Germany.

The Earl of Crawford intends to issue in the spring of 1908 a bibliographical description, précis, and census of copies of all Tudor and Stuart proclamations, manuscript or printed, that can be found. The material for the work has lately been sent to the printer; it will be published by the Clarendon Press.

Professor C. H. Firth and Mrs. S. C. Lomas have compiled a useful handbook entitled *Notes on the Diplomatic Relations of England and France, 1603-1688* (Oxford, B. H. Blackwell, 1906, pp. 47), consisting of lists of English ambassadors and diplomatic agents from England to France and from France to England, with references showing where the letters and instructions of each ambassador are to be found, both in manuscript and in print.

We should have noted earlier an interesting book by Lewis H. Berens on *The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth*, as revealed in the writings of Gerrard Winstanley, the Digger, Mystic and Rationalist, Communist and Social Reformer (London, Simpkin, pp. 260).

Miss Eva Scott continues her history of the Continental wanderings of Charles II. down to his return to England in May, 1660, in her volume on *The Travels of the King*, announced for publication by Messrs. Constable.

In his *Essai d'une Psychologie de l'Angleterre Contemporaine, Les Crises Belliqueuses* (Paris, Alcan), M. Jacques Bardoux treats of the development of English political thought during the past century with reference to the national attitude toward the questions of peace and war.

New volumes in the series of *Victoria County Histories* are Lincoln, vol. II.; Norfolk, vol. II.; Northampton, vol. II.; Essex, vol. II., and Hertfordshire Families, a genealogical volume of the *History*.

Elizabethan Ireland, Native and English (Dublin, Sealy, Bryers, and Walker, pp. xvi, 294), by G. B. O'Connor, is a survey of Ireland in Elizabethan times including a copy of the map of Ireland made by John Norden between 1609 and 1611, and preserved in the State Paper Office, London.

British government publications: *Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* on the manuscripts of the Dean and Chapter of Wells, vol. I.; on the manuscripts of the Earl of Verulam, preserved at Gorhambury; on American manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain, vol. II.; on manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, preserved at Kilkenny Castle, new series, vol. IV.; on the manuscripts of the Marquess of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, part XI.; and "manuscripts in various collections", vol. IV.; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1675-1676*; *Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1663-1665*.

Other documentary publications: J. K. Floyer, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Chapter Library of Worcester Cathedral*

[edited and revised by S. G. Hamilton] (Worcester Historical Society, pp. 214); W. Foster, *The English Factories in India, 1618-1621*, a Calendar of Documents in the Indian Office, British Museum, and Public Record Office (Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. xliii, 379); R. V. Hamilton and J. K. Laughton, *Recollections of James Anthony Gardner, Commander R.N. (1775-1814)* (Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XXXI.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. M. Powicke, *The Angevin Administration of Normandy*, II. (English Historical Review, January); W. M. Bryce, *Mary Stuart's Voyage to France in 1548* (English Historical Review, January); Louise F. Brown, *The Religious Factors in the Convention Parliament* (English Historical Review, January); Hume Brown, *The Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland, 1707* (Scottish Historical Review, January); *The English Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century* (Edinburgh Review, January); *The First Earl of Durham and Colonial Aspiration* (Edinburgh Review, January).

FRANCE

M. E. Rouard de Card has published through the house of Pédone, Paris, a collection of the *Traité de la France avec les Pays de l'Afrique du Nord: Algérie, Tunisie, Tripolitaine, Maroc* (pp. xv, 422). The earliest document included is the treaty between France and Tunis concluded in 1270; the latest, the general act of the conference of Algéciras.

Le Royaume de Bourgogne is the title of a large volume by M. René Poupardin, announced for immediate publication by Champion, Paris.

M. L. Halphen's *Étude sur les Chroniques des Comtes d'Anjou et des Seigneurs d'Amboise* (Paris, Champion, 1906, pp. 64) is a continuation and a criticism of Mabille's study of these chronicles. *Le Comté d'Anjou au XI^e Siècle* (Paris, Picard, 1906, pp. xxiv, 428), by the same author, is an elaborate investigation from the territorial and internal point of view of the development of the county in the eleventh century. The work includes a catalogue of the *Actes* of Fulk Nerra, Geoffrey Martel, Geoffrey the Bearded, and Fulk Rechin.

La Jeunesse de Louis XI., 1423-1445 (Paris, Perrin), by Marcel Thibault, is a well-documented study, not only of the young king, but also of France in the fifteenth century. The book by the same author on the youth of Isabel of Bavaria, queen of France (1370-1405), was crowned by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences.

The third volume of the excellent *Histoire de la Marine Française* (Paris, Plon-Nourrit, 1906; pp. 612), by Charles de la Roncière, bears the subtitle *Les Guerres d'Italie: Liberté des Mers*, and comprises the period within the years 1494 and 1559. The second part of the volume throws light on French enterprise in American waters.

The Société d'Histoire Moderne, whose annual volumes, the *Répertoire Méthodique de l'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine de la France*,

furnish a complete bibliography of writings on modern French history published since 1898, has undertaken the useful task of producing a bibliography of the writings relating to French history after 1500, published from 1866 to 1897. The portion of the work relating to the history of France since 1789, which has been deemed of most urgent importance and has therefore been first compiled by P. Caron, will shortly be issued under the title *Bibliographie des Travaux publiés de 1866 à 1897 sur l'Histoire de la France depuis 1789* (Paris, Cornély).

A collection of *Mémoires et Souvenirs sur la Révolution et l'Empire*, with many hitherto unpublished documents, edited by M. G. Lenôtre, is announced by Messrs. Perrin. The first volume is on the *Massacres de Septembre* and includes the official *dossier des massacreurs*.

The fifth series of Professor A. Aulard's *Études et Leçons sur la Révolution Française* (Alcan) contains the following studies: The Thermidorian reaction at Paris; the origins of the separation of the churches and the state; notes on the history of the concordat; the text of the discourse of Danton; Danton and the avocat Lavaux.

In the new volume by A. Mathiez, entitled *Contributions à l'Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution Française* (Paris, Alcan, 1907, pp. xii, 272), the author regards the Revolution as a religious phenomenon, thus maintaining the position held in his earlier contributions to the same subject.

The house of Manzi, Joyant, and Co. (Paris) announce for publication during the current year *Le Livre du Sacre*, containing reproductions of the designs of Isabey, Percier, and Fontaine, executed for the ceremony of Napoleon's coronation and preserved at the Louvre. The plates will be accompanied by a text by Frédéric Masson. Only 350 copies will be printed, which will be sold at from 300 to 500 francs each.

L'Épiscopat Français depuis le Concordat jusqu'à la Séparation (1802-1905), the work of ninety collaborators, has been published under the auspices of the Bibliographical Society (Paris, Librairie des Saints-Pères, pp. xvi, 720). This useful volume contains brief notices of each bishopric, accounts of all the titularies of every see, and bibliographies. In connection with the Canon Paul Pisani's *Répertoire Bibliographique de l'Épiscopat Constitutionnel* noted in the last number of this journal, it is reviewed by M. Lanzac de Laborie in *Le Correspondant* of February 10 (pp. 475-486).

Mr. Oscar Browning is publishing through Mr. John Lane a work entitled *The Fall of Napoleon*, a companion volume to *The First Phase*, later published under the title *The Boyhood and Youth of Napoleon*. The new book begins with Napoleon's return to Paris after the Russian disaster and ends with a history of his surrender at Aix.

Messrs. Chapelot announce M. Ed. Bonnal's work, *Les Royalistes contre l'Armée, 1815-1820*, based on documents found in the archives of

the War Ministry, recording the persecution inflicted by Louis XVIII's government on the marshals and generals of Napoleon's army.

The first volume of a historical work on *La France Moderne et le Problème Colonial* (Alcan), by M. Christian Schefer, professor at the École Libre des Sciences Politiques, deals with traditions and new ideals, the administrative reorganization, and the revival of expansion from 1815 to 1830.

The ninth volume of the great *Histoire Socialiste* (Paris, Rouff) of M. Jaurès is the history of the *République de 1848* by M. G. Renard, professor of the history of labor at the National Conservatory of Arts and Trades, and founder of the Society for the History of 1848. The part of the book that treats of economic history is almost entirely new. A brochure of *Notes et Références* (pp. 33), with indexes to the volume, has been published separately through Cornély.

The *Procès-Verbaux de la Commission des Travailleurs de l'Assemblée Constituante*, edited by M. Georges Renard, will form the first volume in the *Bibliothèque* of the Society for the History of l' : Revolution of 1848.

Rome et Napoléon III., 1849-1870 (Paris, Colin, pp. 370), by MM. É. Bourgeois and É. Clermont, is an important study of the origins and downfall of the Second Empire, based upon documents many of which are cited in full.

Documentary publications: E. Deville, *Cartulaire de l'Église de la Sainte-Trinité de Beaumont-le-Roger* (Paris, Champion); Dietrich von Lassberg, *Mein Kriegstagebuch aus dem Deutsch-Französischen Krieg, 1870-1871* (Munich, Oldenbourg, pp. viii, 347).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Espinas, *Une Bibliographie de "L'Histoire Économique de la France au Moyen Age"* [review of P. Boissonnade's *Les Études relatives à l'Histoire Économique de la France au Moyen Age*] (*Le Moyen Age*, November-December); H. Baraude, *Le Siège d'Orléans et Jeanne d'Arc, 1428-1429*, concl. (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, January); G. Ascoli, *Essai sur l'Histoire des Idées Féministes en France, du XVI^e Siècle à la Révolution*, concl. (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, October); V. Pinot, *Les Physiocrates et la Chine au XVIII^e Siècle* (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, December); O. Thiele, *François Quesnay und die Agrarkrisis im Ancien Régime* (*Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, IV. 3); P. Sagnac, *Étude Statistique sur le Clergé Constitutionnel et le Clergé Réfractaire en 1791* [with map] (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, November); A. Mathiez, *L'Exercice du Culte sous la première Séparation, 1795-1802* (*Revue Politique et Parlementaire*, January); P. Muret, *La Question des Alliances en 1869 et 1870, d'après des Publications Récentes* (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, November); C. Jullian, *Augustin Thierry et le Mouvement Historique sous la Restauration* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, October).

ITALY, SPAIN

M. Champion of Paris is publishing a revised and enlarged edition of M. Pierre de Nolhac's two-volume work on *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*.

Documenti per la Storia dei Rivolgimenti Politici del Comune di Siena dal 1354 al 1369 (Paris, Picard) contains besides the documents, which occupy more than three-quarters of the volume, an introductory commentary thereon, and an account of the earlier political history of the republic by the editor, M. G. Luchaire.

Signor F. Lemmi's book on *Le Origini del Risorgimento Italiano; 1789-1815* (1906, pp. vii, 458) forms one of the *Collezione Storica Villari*, published by Hoepli, Milan.

A new collection of documents for the history of Castile, *Fuentes para la Historia de Castilla*, has been undertaken by the Benedictines of Silos. The first volume, containing documents prior to the sixteenth century relating to the Benedictine monastery of El Moral, has been edited by Father Serrano under the title *Coleccion Diplomatica de San-Salvador de El Moral* (Valladolid, 1906, pp. lxviii, 280).

The development of the study of the history of Spanish law is the theme of a *discours d'ouverture* delivered at the Central University of Madrid by Rafaël de Ureña y Smenjaud: *Universidad Central: Discours leído en la Solemne Inauguracion del Curso Academico de 1906 et 1907* (Madrid, Imprenta Colonial, 1906, pp. 156).

Documentary publications: G. Bourgin, *Fonti per la Storia dei Dipartimenti Romani negli Archivi Nazionali di Parigi* [inventory of the documents in the Archives Nationales concerning the Roman State during its reunion to the French Empire, 1809-1814] (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXIX.); C. Cecchini, *Lettere Inedite di Giuseppe Mazzini* (Archivio Storico Italiano, XXXVIII.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Güterbock, *Die Lage der ronalischen Ebene* (Quellen und Forschungen, IX. 2); Andrew D. White, *The Statesmanship of Cavour* (Atlantic Monthly, March); Fidel Fita, *Concilio de Gerona en 1117* (Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia, July-September); *El Monasterio de San-Servando en la Mitad del Siglo XI.* (*ibid.*, October); *El Concilio Nacional de Burgos en 1080* (*ibid.*, November).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND

The first volume of *Die Entwicklung des deutschen Städtewesens*, by Hugo Preuss, deals with the *Entwicklungsgeschichte der deutschen Städteverfassung* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1906, pp. xii, 379), beginning with the Roman *civitas* upon German soil and coming down to the year 1906.

A prize work by Dr. Wilhelm Kisky, *Die Domkapitel der geistlichen Kurfürsten in ihrer persoenlichen Zusammensetzung im XIV. und XV. Jahrhundert* (Weimar, Boehlaus, 1906, pp. viii, 197), sketches the history

of the formation of cathedral chapters of Cologne, Mayence, and Treves, and gives lists (drawn from manuscripts and printed sources and as nearly complete as possible) of the members of these chapters.

The first fascicle of *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte der Reichsstadt Frankfurt* (Leipzig, Duncker and Humblot, 1906, pp. ix, 172) includes two studies by Dr. F. Bothe, one entitled *Aus Frankfurt's Alten Rechenbüchern*, in which he explains their importance as sources for the history of civilization; the second treating of the economic condition of the population of Frankfort at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

In the *comptes-rendu* of October 10, 1906, of the Imperial Academy of Vienna, Professor J. Loserth published a report on his investigations in the archives of Hungary, Styria, and Croatia, undertaken in connection with the publication of the second part of his *Akten und Korrespondenzen zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Inner-Österreich unter Ferdinand II.*

The first part of the new publication of the Commission for the Modern History of Austria, *Archivalien zur neueren Geschichte Österreichs* (Vienna, Holzhausen, pp. vi, 113), contains notices of the private archives of the noble houses of Bohemia.

J. Strieder's *Kritische Forschungen zur Österreichischen Politik* (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1907, pp. viii, 101), extending from the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle to the beginning of the Seven Years' War, forms the second volume of Leipzig Historical Essays, edited by E. Brandenburg, G. Seeliger, and U. Wilcken.

Geschichte der Deutschen in Galizien bis 1772 (1907, pp. xxii, 369), part of a general history of the Germans in Carpathian lands, has been contributed by Professor R. F. Kaindl to the division of *Deutsche Landesgeschichten* in Professor Lamprecht's series of *Allgemeine Staatengeschichte* (Gotha, Perthes).

Documentary publications: A. F. Fuchs, *Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte der Aufgehobenen Kartause Aggsbach V.O. W.W.* [Fontes Rerum Austriacarum, Abtlg. II., *Diplomataria et Acta*, Bd. 59] (Historical Commission of the Vienna Academy of Sciences, Vienna, A. Hölder, 1906, pp. xxix, 442).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Wehrmann, *Vatikanische Quellen zur deutschen Landesgeschichte* (Deutsche Geschichtsblätter, January); F. Keutgen, *Hansische Handelsgesellschaften, vornehmlich des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Vierteljahrsschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, IV. 3); W. Ebstein, *Die letzte Krankheit des Kaisers Sigmund* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXVII. 4); J. Müller, *Die Hauptwege des nürnbergischen Handels im Spätmittelalter* (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, V. 1); A. H. Loebl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der kaiserlichen Zentralverwaltung im ausge-*

henden 16. Jahrhundert (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXVII. 4).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The Netherlands government has authorized Professor G. W. Kernkamp, of Utrecht, to examine the archives of Denmark and the cities of the Baltic for historical material relating to the Netherlands. This is a continuation of Professor Kernkamp's exploration of Scandinavian archives, on which he has already published several reports.

Professor F. J. L. Kraemer is publishing through the house of Nyhoff, at the Hague, a third series of the *Archives ou Correspondance inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau*, which will cover the period from 1688 to 1795. The first volume, which is furnished with an historical introduction and notes (pp. lviii, 642), contains 500 letters, dating from 1689 to 1697, drawn from the correspondence of William III. with Antonius Heinsius.

Dr. H. T. Colenbrander, Secretary of the Dutch Royal Historical Commission, has published the second volume of the *Gedenkstukken der Algemeene Geschiedenis van Nederland van 1795 tot 1840* (The Hague, Nyhoff, 1906, pp. cxxx, 1035). The volume contains the text of 842 documents relating to the history of the Batavian revolution, from 1795 to June 12, 1798, and an extended introduction.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Bigwood, *Gand et la Circulation des Grains en Flandre, du XIV^e. au XVIII^e. Siècle* (Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, IV. 3).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The Romanes lecture for 1906 was on *Sturla the Historian* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, pp. 24), by W. M. Ker, Fellow of All Souls College. Sturla was a member of one of the great families of Iceland in the thirteenth century and the author of a large part of the *Sturlunga Saga*.

U. L. Lehtonen's work on the early relations of the Russian government to their Polish subjects has been translated from the Finnish by Gustav Schmidt under the title *Die polnischen Provinzen Russlands unter Katharina II. in den Jahren 1772-1782* (Berlin, Reimer, 1907, pp. 634).

The Russian Academy of Sciences (section of the Russian language and literature) proposes to begin in 1907 the publication of a complete collection of the works of ancient Russian literature from the end of the eleventh century to the time of Peter the Great. Preliminary to this undertaking is the volume by Professor N. Nikolsky, of the ecclesiastical academy of St. Petersburg, on *Materialy dlia sovremennago spiska russkikh pisatelci i ikh sotchinonii* (Materials for the knowledge

of the extant codices containing works of Russian writers) (St. Petersburg, 1906).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The staff of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has been strengthened by the accession of Professor Edmund C. Burnett, formerly of Mercer University, who will have special charge of the work on the letters of the delegates to the Old Congress. Miss Davenport has returned from England with the materials necessary for making complete Professor Andrews's *Guide* with respect to the lesser repositories of American material in London—the archives of the House of Lords, the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of London, the archbishop of Westminster, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Hudson's Bay Company, Sion College, etc. As soon as these materials can be properly combined with Professor Andrews's text, the book will be ready for the press. Mr. Waldo G. Leland will go to Paris in June, for a year's work in the preparation of a similar guide to the materials for American and, by arrangement with the Canadian archives office, also Canadian history in the Parisian archives. It is expected that Professor H. E. Bolton will be able at the same time to proceed to Mexico. Mr. Pérez's *Guide to the Archives of Cuba* has gone to press. Professor Shepherd's Spanish report is expected to be finished in May. Mr. Leland's revised edition of Van Tyne and Leland's *Guide to the Archives of the Government in Washington* is ready for the press. Dr. H. M. Bowman has labored upon the preliminaries of the proposed edition of the American debates in Parliament.

In an article on "Gaps in the Published Records of United States History", published in this journal last July, in a passage relating to gaps that might be filled from English sources, four chief desiderata of that sort were noted: a series of the colonial items in the Registers of the Privy Council, a series of the royal proclamations relating to America, a series of the colonial acts of Parliament, and a series of the debates in Parliament on American subjects. It is pleasing to know that all four gaps are already in a fair way to be filled. The Lords of the Treasury have provided for the printing of the first, and the editorial expenses seem likely to be met by English, American and Canadian contributions. A committee of the American Antiquarian Society, appointed to consider the second, has strongly recommended its adoption. Professor William MacDonald had already undertaken the third; and the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution is making preparatory investigations toward the fourth.

The Secretaries of War, the Interior and Agriculture have jointly issued, under the act of June 8, 1906, a set of regulations for the supervision of historic and prehistoric ruins, archaeological sites, monuments,

and structures and other landmarks of scientific interest, located within the jurisdiction of the departments indicated. These regulations prescribe the manner in which permits for the work of exploration, examination or excavation shall be given, and the conditions under which objects of interest may be removed from their original locations.

A short comprehensive history of the United States is about to be published by Charles Scribner's Sons: *A Bird's Eye View of American History*, by Leon C. Prince.

Under the direction of the Department of Economics and Sociology in the Carnegie Institution Miss Adelaide R. Hasse has prepared an analytical index to the economic material in the various documents of the American state governments. The analysis for each state will be issued as a separate book. The first of these, Maine, has just been sent to the press. The next to follow will be New York, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

Messrs. Henkels and Morrison of Philadelphia issue a prospectus of a *Bibliography of the State, Town, County and Territorial History of the United States*, compiled by Thomas L. Bradford, M.D., and edited and revised by Stan. V. Henkels. It is expected to embrace about seven thousand titles and to be published in about five octavo volumes. It is proposed to arrange the titles alphabetically by authors, a mode the worst possible for the use of historical scholars, though perhaps convenient for collectors. It is sincerely to be hoped that a geographical order or one alphabetical by place-names, recommended by obvious considerations and usual in such works, will be substituted before publication. In the specimen page (Acrelius) we note fourteen misprints.

The more special fields in political science are coming to be occupied by American reviews of the first grade. In the pages corresponding to these in the last issue we announced the appearance of the *American Political Science Review*. It is an equally pleasant task to announce the first issue (January) of another quarterly of similar grade though in a more special field, the *American Journal of International Law*, published by the American Society of International Law under the supervision of Professor James B. Scott, solicitor of the Department of State, as managing editor, assisted by Messrs. C. N. Gregory, Robert Lansing, J. B. Moore, W. W. Morrow, L. S. Rowe, O. S. Straus, G. G. Wilson, T. S. Woolsey and D. J. Hill, who constitute the board of editors. The first issue aims to cover the year 1906 and is on that account more bulky than the succeeding issues will be. The leading articles are by Hon. Elihu Root, "The Need of Popular Understanding of International Law"; John W. Foster, "International Responsibility to Corporate Bodies for Lives Lost by Outlawry"; J. B. Moore, "International Law: Its Present and Future"; George B. Davis, "Doctor Francis Lieber's Instructions for the Government of Armies in the

Field"; A. S. Hershey, "The Calvo and Drago Doctrines"; G. G. Wilson, "Insurgency and International Maritime Law"; C. B. Elliot, "The Doctrine of Continuous Voyages"; and Robert Lansing, "Notes on Sovereignty". The regular departments of the journal are devoted to a chronicle of international events, to a survey of public documents relating to international law, to a summary of judicial decisions involving questions of international law, to book-reviews and notes, and to the periodical literature of the subject. As a supplement, separately bound, is published a body of official documents recently issued or bearing on recent international events.

The collection of *State Documents on Federal Relations*, edited by Herman V. Ames, the final installment of which was noted in these pages in January, has been issued in book form by the department of history of the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1906, pp. 320). It includes 155 documents bearing on the relations of the states to the federal government, 1789-1861, and "comprises typical papers covering the official action of various states in different sections of the country, relative to the chief political and constitutional issues in our history."

The Government Printing Office has recently put forth as House Document No. 326, 59th Congress, second session, on *Citizenship of the United States, Expatriation and Protection Abroad*, the report of the commission consisting of Messrs. James B. Scott, David J. Hill, and Gaillard Hunt, appointed in accordance with the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of June 9, 1906. The report takes up in detail the protection of the American citizen abroad, the protection abroad of those who have made the declaration of intention to become citizens, expatriation, and citizenship of married women and of alien-born minor children. Three appendixes contain much documentary material.

In *The Stars and Stripes and Other American Flags* (Little, Brown) the author, Peleg D. Harrison, deals with the origin and history of the various American flags, the regulations of the War and Navy Departments respecting them, legislation relating to the national standard, and the flags of the Confederacy.

The issues of the *Magazine of History* for October, November and December devote a generous amount of space to reprinting material from other publications: H. Addington Bruce's "New Light on the Mecklenburg Declaration", from the *North American Review*; Thomas Featherstonhaugh's "A Private Mint in North Carolina", from the *Publications of the Southern History Association*; as well as several other contributions of this class. Of the new material we note Warren Upham's article in the October number, on the "Founders of the Fur Trade in Northern Minnesota".

American Public Men, by John A. Larkin (Dodd, Mead, and Company), is intended as a manual for autograph collectors. It contains, for example, lists of the members of the Stamp Act Congress, of the generals of the Revolutionary War, of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Articles of Confederation, and Constitution, of the members of the Continental Congress, of the governors or presidents of the thirteen independent colonies, of the parents and ancestors of the Presidents of the United States, of the justices of the Supreme Court, and of many other groups of public men, including a somewhat apocryphal list of the signers of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. The volume should prove of use for the purpose intended.

Four American Leaders, by Charles W. Eliot (Boston, American Unitarian Association), is a group of addresses dealing with the influence upon American life and progress exerted by Franklin, Washington, Channing, and Emerson.

The *Pennsylvania German* for March continues its symposium on "German Migrations in the United States and Canada".

The November and December issues of the *German American Annals* continue the diary of Rev. Andreas Rudman from July 25, 1696, to June 14, 1697, and contain (December) the address on Carl Schurz delivered by Professor Eugene Kühnemann in Carnegie Hall, New York, on November 21, 1906.

ITEMS CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED

Sophus Ruge et ses Vues sur Colomb, by Mr. Henry Vignaud, has been reprinted from the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris*, tome III., numéro 1.

The Sociedad Astronómica de México has printed a little volume of the proceedings in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Columbus (Mexico, J. I. Durán y cia.). It contains among other matters a paper by Jesus Galindo y Villa: "Algunas Reminiscencias sobre la Navegacion Maritima después del Descubrimiento de América".

In a communication to the *Nation* for January 10, 1907, Mr. G. R. F. Prowse, of Manitoba, states that he has recently discovered evidence by which he is convinced that the island designated as "Litus incognitum" in Waldseemüller's World Map of 1507 was copied at first hand from the lost chart made by Cabot in 1497. He claims thus to place beyond dispute the fact of Cabot's landfall on June 24, 1497, at Cape Bonavista, and to determine approximately the extent of his exploration from Cape Freels around Bonavista Bay to Catalina Harbor, in Trinity Bay.

In the series of "Original Narratives of Early American History" the second volume (third to be issued), *Spanish Explorers in the Southern United States, 1528-1543*, has now appeared. The fourth

volume, *The Voyages of Champlain*, edited by Mr. W. L. Grant, is in the press. The fifth, *Narratives of Early Virginia*, edited by President Lyon G. Tyler, is almost ready. Bradford and Winthrop, edited respectively by Hon. William T. Davis and Dr. James K. Hosmer, are in active preparation.

Miss Adelaide R. Hasse of the New York Public Library is making preparations for the publication at some future time of a complete series of the commissions and instructions issued to governors of the American colonies.

Mr. W. K. Bixby has in the press, for private printing, a journal kept by Dr. Alexander Hamilton, a physician of Baltimore, who took a trip through New England and the Middle States in 1754. The volume will have an introduction by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart.

The first volume of *The Record of the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin, under the Auspices of the American Philosophical Society* has appeared. It contains the speeches and letters brought out by the Franklin bi-centennial observed in Philadelphia last April.

A new volume in the series of "True Biographies" (J. B. Lippincott) is in preparation: *Patrick Henry*, by George Morgan.

The De Burians of Bangor have put forth as volume III. of their publications *The Revolutionary Journal of Colonel Jeduthun Baldwin, 1775-1778*, edited with a memoir and notes by Thomas Williams Baldwin.

We have received three reprints from volume XXXII. of the *Proceedings of the United States Naval Institute*, of Mr. C. O. Paullin's recent contributions to that journal: "The Conditions of Continental Naval Service", "Early Naval Administration under the Constitution", and "Naval Administration under Secretaries of the Navy Smith, Hamilton, and Jones, 1801-1814."

Jefferson's Germantown Letters, compiled by Mr. Charles F. Jenkins, and issued by W. J. Campbell of Philadelphia in an edition of 500 copies, contains sixty-eight letters to and from Jefferson during November of 1793, when he, together with the other members of Washington's cabinet, was in Germantown. The volume is the third in a series of books dealing with Germantown.

Pilots of the Republic, from the industrious pen of Archer B. Hulbert (Chicago, A. C. McClurg), deals with the early westward movement with the purpose of showing the part played therein by the "pioneer promoters", among whom are classed Washington, Richard Henderson, Rufus Putnam, David Zeisberger, George Rogers Clark, Gouverneur Morris, De Witt Clinton, Marcus Whitman, and others.

We have received volume VII. of the *Documentary History of the Campaign on the Niagara Frontier*, collected and edited for the Lundy's Lane Historical Society, by Lieutenant-colonel E. Cruikshank (Wel-

land, 1905, pp. 280). The present volume covers the period August-October, 1813.

Mr. W. K. Bixby is privately printing the letters of General Zachary Taylor from Matamoras and Brownsville regarding the Mexican War.

Volume XV. of *The History of North America* is by the general editor, Francis N. Thorpe: *The Civil War: the National View* (Philadelphia, G. Barrie and Sons, pp. 535).

A recent regimental history, *History of the One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers, 1862-1863*, has been prepared by the regimental committee (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott).

Messrs. Baker and Taylor announce that they will publish this fall the autobiography of General O. O. Howard.

The recent centennial of Robert E. Lee has called forth not a little literature respecting that general. Aside from works mentioned in previous issues we note *General Lee, his Campaigns in Virginia, 1861-1865, with Personal Reminiscences* by Walter H. Taylor (Norfolk, Virginia) and *Life of Robert Edward Lee*, by Henry E. Shepherd (Neale Publishing Company). The address delivered by Charles Francis Adams at Lexington, Virginia, on January 19, 1907, has been printed in pamphlet form: *Lee's Centennial*.

A volume that should prove to be of unusual interest among the many similar volumes now being published is announced by Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons: *Military Memoirs: a Critical Narrative*, by General E. P. Alexander, who was chief of ordnance in the Army of Northern Virginia and later was general and chief of artillery in Longstreet's corps.

Two volumes of reminiscences of services in Mosby's band of partizan rangers have recently appeared: *Reminiscences of a Mosby Guerrilla*, by John W. Munson (New York, Moffat, Yard, and Company), and *Mosby's Men*, by John H. Alexander (Neale Publishing Company). It is worth noting that in the former the charge that Mosby's followers sometimes disguised themselves in blue uniforms is denied.

The Life and Services of John Newland Maffitt, by Emma M. Maffitt (Neale Publishing Company), is a biographical account of Captain Maffitt of the Confederate navy. Maffitt was attached to the frigate *Constitution* in 1835, and the volume contains considerable material relating to the service of that vessel. At the opening of the war he became a privateer in the Confederate service, in which capacity he was conspicuously successful, and was rewarded with a regular appointment. Much of the material in the present volume is taken from an autobiographical document bearing the title of "Nautilus".

The Neale Publishing Company have put forth a *Life of Dr. Samuel A. Mudd*, edited by his daughter, Nettie Mudd, with a preface by D. E. Monroe. The volume contains Dr. Mudd's letters written from Fort Jefferson on Dry Tortugas Island, where he was imprisoned for four

years for alleged complicity in the assassination of Lincoln, together with statements made by him and by Mrs. Mudd and Edward Spangler regarding the assassination, and the so-called "diary" of John Wilkes Booth.

Under the title *Speeches Incident to the Visit of Secretary Root to South America* the Government Printing Office has issued a volume of 300 pages, composed of the speeches made by Secretary Root and by the officials of the South American republics during the former's recent tour. Over fifty addresses are recorded.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

New England Town Law, by James S. Garland (Boston Book Company), is a digest of statutes and decisions, and is intended mainly to serve a practical purpose. In the long introduction, however, is an account of the history and functions of the New England town, which is of considerable historical interest.

On February 27 the Maine Historical Society dedicated its new library building on Congress Street, Portland. Addresses were delivered by Hon. James P. Baxter, Rev. J. C. Perkins, Hon. A. F. Moulton and Professor Allen Johnson. An elaborate account of the exercises is printed in the *Portland Daily Press* of February 28.

An enormous amount of material of local importance has been gathered and put into a book of 700 pages by Francis B. Greene, *A History of Boothbay, Southport and Boothbay Harbor, Maine* (Portland, Loring, Greene, and Harman). The volume is illustrated with maps, cuts, and portraits, and contains the genealogies of many of the families of the region.

The *New Hampshire Genealogical Record* for January prints another group of documents bearing on Revolutionary naval service. They are an account of the launching of the Continental frigate *Raleigh*, taken from the *New Hampshire Gazette* of May 25, 1776; the report of Captain Hector McNeil to the Marine Committee of Congress, relating to the first cruise of the *Boston*, a list of the officers and men attached to the *Boston*, and extracts from the journal of one of that vessel's crew, Benjamin Crowningshield.

In the *Granite State Magazine* for January we note the "Life and Character of Ruel Durkee"; "Rogers's Scout at Lake George, September 14-24, 1755" (document), edited by G. Waldo Browne; and "First Glass Making in America, An Industry of a New Hampshire Town", by Charles B. Heald.

The Massachusetts Historical Society has received from the estate of the late Charles E. French his large collection of manuscripts, books, pamphlets, broadsides, newspapers, etc. The collection is very miscellaneous, but appears to include much of value, especially several

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XII. — 47.

thousand manuscripts, among which are many letters of Revolutionary personages, civil and military, statesmen, literary men, and others.

The Massachusetts State Library has recently come into possession of the log-book of the *Constitution* for the period from June 26, 1825, to November 7, 1826.

The third volume of the Bostonian Society's publications contains an account of the preparation for the expedition to Nova Scotia in 1710, together with papers relating to Faneuil Hall, reminiscences of Boston in 1813, and a map of the harbor in 1711.

The Boston Athenaeum has produced a beautifully made book in *Topliff's Travels*. This contains letters from Europe in the years 1828 and 1829, by Samuel Topliff, proprietor of the old Merchants' News Room in Boston, printed from the original manuscript owned by the Athenaeum, and edited with a memoir and notes by Ethel S. Bolton. Of most interest perhaps in the volume is Topliff's account of his visit to Lafayette.

There has recently been printed at the Riverside Press, for private distribution, a biographical sketch of *Nathaniel Goddard, a Boston Merchant, 1767-1853*.

Of note in the *Historical Collections of the Essex Institute* for January are "An Etched Profile Portrait of Washington, by Joseph Hiller, Jr., 1794", by Charles Henry Hart, and further Revolutionary letters to Timothy Pickering from George Williams of Salem.

The first volume of the *Proceedings* of the newly organized Cambridge Historical Society is at hand. The volume, like the corresponding publication of the Massachusetts Historical Society, which it somewhat resembles in general form, consists of the reports of the meetings of the society and of the communications made at the meetings. Of most historical moment among these are: "Reminiscences of Old Cambridge", by Charles Eliot Norton; the address by Reverend Alexander McKenzie, bearing on the Customs of the First Church in Cambridge; the report of the Committee on the Identification and Marking of Historic Sites in Cambridge; and addresses by Messrs. Joseph Willard, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and Woodward Emery, dealing with their reminiscences of the late John Bartlett.

A History of the Town of Middleboro, by Thomas Weston (Houghton, Mifflin), should prove of interest and service to those interested in the local history of Massachusetts. Another contribution to the same field is *Plymouth Memories of an Octogenarian*, by William T. Davis (Plymouth, Mass., Bettinger Brothers). The volume is of especial interest for its bearing on the history of shipping in Plymouth.

"The Physical Evolution of New York City in a Hundred Years, 1807-1907", by John Austin Stevens, is one of the more important contributions to the January number of the *American Historical Magazine*.

Volume IX. of the *Publications* of the Buffalo Historical Society, edited by Frank H. Severance, contains, as usual, several contributions of more than ordinary historical value. "The Johnson's Island Plot", by F. J. Shepard, is an interesting monograph on one phase of the operations of the Confederate government in Canada and New York. "Millard Fillmore and His Part in the Opening of Japan", by Dr. William E. Griffis, is said to mark the beginning by Dr. Griffis of an elaborate biographical study of President Fillmore; of particular interest perhaps is the information given by the writer respecting the destruction of Fillmore's papers. The two contributions just noted are followed by a long paper by Frank H. Severance relating to Joncaire, and by a number of shorter papers relating to the burning of Buffalo and to events of the Niagara frontier before and during the War of 1812. There should also be mentioned some documentary material relating to Louis Le Couteulx.

In *Cape Vincent and Its History* (Watertown, N. Y., Hungerford-Hollbrook Company) the compiler, Mrs. Nellie H. Casler, has included a large amount of documentary material taken from the transcripts of documents in the British archives, on file in the Dominion archives at Ottawa, relating to the Revolution and to the part played by Cape Vincent as a base of supplies and as a fortification.

An Oneida County Printer, by John C. Williams (Scribner's Sons), is a bibliography of Utica imprints from 1803 to 1838, and an account of the life and work of William Williams.

The leading article in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for October, 1906, is by Lina Sinnickson, on Frederika, Baroness Riedesel, the wife of the general commanding the Brunswick troops in the Revolution. The Baroness accompanied her husband to America, and the article, illustrated with several old prints, deals largely with her experiences in this country. Other articles and contributions are: "The Wilson Portrait of Franklin", by Charles H. Hart, "Journey of Isaac Zane to Wyoming, 1758", communicated by Joseph H. Coates, and continuations of documents already noted.

The Maryland Historical Society prints in the December number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* a paper read before the society by B. U. Campbell in 1846, on "Early Missions among the Indians in Maryland". Another paper, read in 1878, by Reverend George A. Leakin, on "The Labadists of Bohemia Manor", is also printed. Several interesting documents find place in the present issue, especially a letter from a Jacobite exile, of June 2, 1717, and a letter from John R. Caldwell of August 31, 1807, relating to the capture of a French pirate.

Part I. of Bernard C. Steiner's *Maryland during the English Civil Wars* has been published as Nos. 11-12, series XXIV., of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. It is

a continuation of the *Beginnings of Maryland* (1903), by the same author.

The Columbian Historical Society has in preparation a volume containing all the letters written by Washington with respect to the planning and establishment of the District of Columbia and the capital city.

Among the articles in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* for January are three of historical interest. "Lee in Defeat", by Thomas Nelson Page, is perhaps more marked by the writer's appreciation of Lee's greatness of character than by sound historical judgment. A contribution by J. C. Hildt of "Letters relating to the Capture of Washington", is composed mainly of extracts from the papers of Brigadier-general William H. Winder, now at the Johns Hopkins University; while J. G. de R. Hamilton's article, "A Notable Achievement in Historical Writing", is a review of the concluding volumes of James Ford Rhodes's work.

The November issue of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* opens with a document from the Cuban archives, edited by L. M. Pérez, relating to the expedition of Lopez of 1850-1851: "Narrative of Events Connected with the Late Intended Invasion of Cuba. By Duncan Smith, i. e., Dr. Henry Burtnett (July, 1851)". Following is an article by General Marcus J. Wright on "Benedict Arnold: The Good in Him".

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for January contains the proceedings of the annual meeting held in December, 1906, including the President's report by Mr. Joseph Bryan. Among the accessions therein noted should be mentioned an index to names in the Minute Books of the General Court of Virginia from 1670 to 1676, and a collection in two volumes of all the references to Revolutionary officers and soldiers appearing in the journals of the Conventions and of the House of Delegates during its first fifteen years. Among the documents presented in this number are the "Journals of the Council of Virginia in Executive Sessions" from November 9, 1738, to May 1, 1739; a deposition by William Crew of November 11, 1775, relating to the boundary dispute between Virginia and Pennsylvania; various intercepted letters of Norfolk and Portsmouth Tories of 1775; letters from county committees of November, 1775; and some papers bearing on Bacon's rebellion from the Library of Congress, together with a list of sources for the history of that uprising.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for February contains the beginning of a list of works relating to Virginia possessed by that library.

The *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* for January reprints a contribution to the *London Magazine* of July, 1746, "Observations in Several Voyages and Travels in America"; continues the "Journal of the President and Masters or Professors of William

and Mary College"; and prints the oath of allegiance imposed by the legislature of Virginia in 1780, together with other documentary material.

A timely publication in view of the Jamestown Exposition is Mrs. Mary Newton Stanard's *The Story of Bacon's Rebellion* (Neale Publishing Company).

We are glad to note the *First Biennial Report of the Department of Archives and History of the State of West Virginia*, by Virgil A. Lewis, state historian and archivist (Charleston, W. Va., 1906, pp. 271). The report contains an account of the various efforts that have been made to promote the historical interests of the state of West Virginia, the act of February, 1905, establishing the Bureau of Archives and History, and a description of the material now in the custody of the bureau. There are printed a list of the regular sessions of the legislature of West Virginia, an account of the legislative archives, bibliographical accounts of the public documents and state papers relating to the period of the reorganized government, and of the same class of material emanating from the government of Virginia and relating to West Virginia, together with much information respecting the seals and flags of the state, members of Congress from that part of Virginia now included in the state of West Virginia, newspapers printed within the state, pioneer forts, stockades and block-houses, Indian names of rivers in West Virginia, etc.

It is encouraging to note that an effort is being made in North Carolina to secure proper treatment for the state archives, which have long been neglected. We have received recently a pamphlet reprinted by the North Carolina Historical Commission from the *North Carolina Booklet*, which contains an address delivered by Mr. R. D. W. Connor before the North Carolina Literary and Historical Association on *A State Library Building and Department of Archives and Records*. Mr. Connor describes graphically the disordered state of the archives and points out clearly the urgent need of making immediate and adequate provision for their security and arrangement. The legislature has just made an appropriation of \$5,000 for the maintenance of the Historical Commission, which will probably enable active measures to be taken at once.

The critical examination by Miss Adelaide L. Fries of the Moravian evidence to the Mecklenburg "Declaration of Independence", mentioned in this section of the last issue, has been reprinted from the *Wachovia Moravian* in pamphlet form, *The Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence as Mentioned in Records of Wachovia* (Raleigh, Edwards and Broughton), illustrated with several photographic facsimiles.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for October and January continues the series of letters from Lafayette to

Henry Laurens, January-February, 1778, and the order-book of the First Regiment of the South Carolina line. The editor furnishes among the "Historical Notes" in the October issue an index to the fourth volume of Bounty Grants (Revolutionary) in the office of the secretary of state, and an illustrated account of the seals of South Carolina.

Volumes three and four of the *Colonial Records of the State of Georgia* have appeared. They contain "The general account of all monies and effects received and expended by the Trustees for establishing the colony of Georgia in America for the carrying on the good purposes of their trust . . . (1732-1752)" and "A journal of the proceedings in Georgia, beginning October 20, 1737. By William Stephens, esq., to which is added, a state of that province, as attested upon oath in the court of Savannah, November 10, 1740", reprinted from the original edition, London, 1742.

Among the contributions in the January *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society, we note accounts of governors James F. Robinson and Thomas E. Bramlette. We may perhaps call attention to the opportunity the *Register* has of printing valuable original material from the state archives, and question if the proper function of the magazine would not be better performed in that way than by devoting as many pages as the present issue does to anecdotes and relatively unimportant material.

At the December meeting of the Louisiana Historical Society Mr. Charles T. Soniat presented a detailed list of 121 original documents in the Archivo Historico Nacional in Madrid, relating to Louisiana. This list was published in full in the *New Orleans Picayune*.

The annual meeting of the Texas State Historical Association was held at the University of Texas on March 2. The addresses were by Herbert E. Bolton on "The Hasinai Indians of East Texas at the Coming of the Spaniards", and by Charles W. Ramsdell on "The Break-up of the Confederacy in Texas."

Part II. of the thirty-first annual report of the (Texas) Commissioner of Agriculture, Insurance, Statistics and History, contains the report of the state librarian for the year ending August 31, 1906, and the second and third annual reports of the classifier and translator of manuscripts. Much information is given respecting the archives of the state and the special collections of manuscripts in the State Library, together with a sketch of the growth of the manuscript collections, and calendars of the Manuel de Salcedo correspondence, 1810-1812, in the Archivo General y Publico of Mexico, and of the Henderson-Yoakum papers, 1845-1857. From the point of view of Texan historical interests, the document is a most encouraging one.

"The Founding of Mission Rosario", by Herbert E. Bolton, is the leading contribution in the October issue of the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association. The article deals especially with

the relations of the Spanish and the coast tribes, and with the inner history of the mission. "The Seat of Government of Texas", by Ernest W. Winkler, in the same issue, deals with the temporary locations of the Texan capitals, from 1824 to 1837.

The "*Old Northwest*" *Genealogical Quarterly* for January continues the autobiography of Governor Allen Trimble, and prints a number of selections from his papers.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* for January is devoted to an account by Lucy E. Keeler of "The Croghan Celebration". The occasion was the celebration by the town of Fremont of the anniversary of the victory on August 2, 1813, of Major William Croghan over General Proctor and Tecumseh.

The issue of the *University Studies* for November-December, published by the University of Cincinnati, is devoted to "The Growth of Ohio", by Frank P. Goodwin. This is intended to serve as a manual of state and local history for the schools of southwestern Ohio, and consists for the most part of excerpts from sources, so arranged as to illustrate the topics included in a well-planned syllabus. Especial emphasis has been placed on the history of Cincinnati and the Miami country.

In the *Indiana Quarterly Magazine of History* for December is much material relating to the battle of Tippecanoe. An account by Judge Isaac Naylor, recently discovered among his papers, describes the writer's experiences in the battle, and is said to contain some new material respecting the conflict. John Tipton's journal of the Tippecanoe campaign, reprinted from the *Indianapolis News* of May 5, 1879, contains a circumstantial account of much interest; the entries extend from September 12 to November 24, 1811. There is also printed the campaign song of 1840, "Tippecanoe and Tyler Too", together with the music as remembered by a contemporary.

Under the title of *Wisconsin in the Civil War*, the "commission for the purpose of devising a plan to provide for the preparation of the history of the Wisconsin soldiers in the Civil War" presents its report (Madison, 1907, pp. 9). The commission indicates four lines of work which should promote the attainment of the object in view: the reprinting of rare published materials and the publication of contemporary manuscripts; the stimulation of research among younger students; the "calling out of meritorious personal recollections, or company and regimental histories, by survivors of the war"; and provision for scholarly monographs and papers based on the material secured in the ways indicated above. In connection with the first suggestion the commission prints a list of Wisconsin regimental histories, indicating those that are most rare.

Of chief moment in the January *Annals of Iowa* is Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh's "Report on the Public Archives", also issued

as a separate pamphlet. The report was prepared in compliance with the request of the trustees of the State Library and Historical Department, for recommendations relative to the installation of a Hall of Public Archives in Iowa under the provisions of the act of the general assembly of April 10, 1906, "providing for the care and permanent preservation of the public archives". The document consists of general information respecting archive matters, especially in the various states of the United States; of an account of the situation in Iowa, and a statement of the problems relative to the public archives in that state; concluding with a specific recommendation as to the method of caring for them. Of especial interest is the scheme of classification of the administrative archives as presented in the report. It may not be out of place in this connection to call attention to the desirability at least in those states where archives are now being rearranged, that uniform plans of arrangement should if practicable be followed. In the same number of the *Annals* is printed an interesting document by William Salter, "Journal of a Missionary in Jackson County, Iowa Territory, 1843-1846."

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for January continues Mr. Buffum's article on "Federal and State Aid to Education in Iowa" and prints "The History and Principles of the Whigs of the Territory of Iowa", by Louis Pelzer, and a long communication from Edgar Hull, defending General William Hull against the condemnations in the diary of Robert Lucas, published in the July number of the *Journal*.

Volume II. of the *Proceedings of the Academy of Science and Letters of Sioux City, Iowa*, for 1905-1906, is at hand. Among the contributions of historical interest may be noted "Reminiscences of John H. Charles", by F. H. Garver, "Result of the Investigation of the Indian Mounds at Broken Kettle Creek", by W. T. Stafford, and "Bibliography of Sioux City Authors", part II., by F. H. Garver.

The State Historical and Natural History Society of Colorado has brought out as No. 1 of its "Historical Series" of *Publications* (Denver, 1906, pp. 159) an illustrated volume by the late William C. Whitford, on *Colorado Volunteers in the Civil War: The New Mexico Campaign in 1862*. The preface is written by Jerome C. Smiley.

A large amount of material relating to the Pacific northwest has been collected by Professor E. S. Meany and will be published by Macmillan in a book on *Vancouver's Discovery of Puget Sound*.

The *Quarterly* of the Oregon Historical Society for March commences the reprint of a book of which only two copies are known to exist: "Route across the Rocky Mountains with a Description of Oregon and California . . . by Overton Johnson and Wm. H. Winter of the Emigration of 1843: Lafayette, Ind., John B. Seamans, Printer, 1846". Among other material in this number may be noted "Recollections of an Oregon Pioneer of 1843", by Samuel Pentecost, and "The First Fruits of the Land", a brief history of early horticulture in Oregon, by Dr. J. R. Cardwell.

The Diary of a Forty-Niner, edited by Chauncey L. Canfield (New York and San Francisco, Morgan Shepard Company), is a record of life in a mining-camp on one of the forks of the Yuba River from May 18, 1850, to June 17, 1852. Some question has been raised as to the authenticity of the volume, and internal evidence has been cited to arouse doubts as to its authorship.

The Discovery, Conquest, and Early History of the Philippine Islands, by E. G. Bourne, is published by A. H. Clark Company (pp. 87).

The recently formed Champlain Society, with headquarters at Toronto, intends publishing two volumes annually. It has in the press an English translation, accompanied by the French text, of Marc Lescarbot's *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*. The translation is the work of Mr. W. L. Grant, Beit Lecturer in Colonial History at Oxford, and the introduction will be contributed by Mr. H. P. Biggar, author of "The Early Trading Companies of New France." To be published also during 1907 is a new edition with translation of Denys's *Description Géographique*, a very rare work, published in 1672, describing the North American coast. This work is in the competent hands of Professor W. F. Ganong, of Smith College. Professor W. Bennett Munro, of Harvard University, whose *Seigniorial System in Canada* (Harvard Historical Studies, XIII.) is just out, is also editing for publication this year a volume of hitherto unpublished *Documents relating to the Seigniorial Régime in Canada*. Professor Adam Shortt, of Queen's University, Canada, is also editing for appearance this year a volume of *Cartwright Papers*, dealing with the Loyalist movement from the United States to Canada, and with the early history of the present province of Ontario. The Society has many other volumes in preparation, e. g., one of naval records of the conquest of Canada, and one on Louisbourg, and promises to be very active. The membership is limited to 250, a number already reached, and libraries are accepted as subscribers to the additional number of 250.

Lord Dorchester, by A. G. Bradley, is the latest addition to the "Makers of Canada" series (Toronto, Morang).

In the January *Acadiensis* we note "The History of Pokemouch", by W. F. Ganong, continuing the series of sketches of the north-shore settlements.

Mr. W. W. Blake of the City of Mexico is about to publish, in two volumes, *Memorias de mis Tiempos*, by Guillermo Prieto, a conspicuous, upright and interesting figure in the politics of the last generation. The volumes, which cover the years 1828 to 1853, are edited by Dr. Nicolas Leon.

A pamphlet of 59 pages, issued by the Musco Nacional of Mexico, is devoted to *Porfirio Díaz, sus Padres, Niñez y Juventud* by Sr. Génaro García. The text is in three chapters covering the career of Díaz to 1854, and documents and a bibliography are appended.

We have received a volume of nearly 600 pages devoted to Cuban local history: *Historia de la Villa de Sagua la Grande y su Jurisdiccion*, by Sr. Antonio M. Alcover y Beltrán, author of *El Periodismo en Sagua*. The volume is made up of "documentos, apuntes, reseñas, monografías, y consideraciones" (Mexico City, Tip. Alcover y Hermano), and treats in detail a wide variety of local topics.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: James A. Burns, *Early Mission Schools of the Franciscans* (Catholic University Bulletin, January); P. A. Bruce, *The Social Life of England's First Colony* (Gentleman's Magazine, January); George S. Hellman, *Some Unpublished Letters of George Washington* (Harper's Magazine, January); C. W. Bowen, *A French Officer with Washington and Rochambeau* (Century Magazine, February); W. M. Sloane, *Von Moltke's View of Washington's Strategy* (Century Magazine, February); C. O. Paullin, *The Massachusetts Navy in the American Revolution* (New England Magazine, January); William S. Rossiter, *The First Census of the United States* (Outlook, December 29, 1906); Burt E. Powell, *Jefferson and the Consular Service* (Political Science Quarterly, January); John F. Simmons, *The Monroe Doctrine: Its Status* (Michigan Law Review, February); A. T. Mahan, *Our Navy Fifty Years Ago* (Harper's Magazine, February); Morris Schaff, *The Spirit of Old West Point* (Atlantic Monthly, February, March); E. P. Oberholtzer, *Jay Cooke and the Financing of the Civil War* (running in the Century Magazine); E. P. Alexander, *The Battle of Bull-Run* (Scribner's Magazine, January); E. P. Alexander, *Grant's Movement against Petersburg* (Scribner's Magazine, February); F. T. Hill, *The Alabama Arbitration Case* (Harper's Magazine, January); Id., *The Hayes-Tilden Contest* (ibid., March); Ida M. Tarbell, *The Tariff in Our Times* (running in the American Magazine).